FILE NO. 250860

Petitions and Communications received from July 24, 2025, through August 28, 2025, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on September 2, 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 Office of the Mayor (MYR), making the following renomination, appointments, and reappointments to the following bodies. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

- Renomination pursuant to Charter, Sections 4.121, to the Building Inspection Commission:
  - Bianca Neumann - term ending July 1, 2027

- Appointment pursuant to Charter, Sections 3.100(18) and 4.107, to the Human Rights Commission:
  - Monroe Lace - term ending September 2, 2028

- Appointment pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 5.201, to the Immigrant Rights Commission:
  - Hessah AlJiran - term ending June 6, 2026

- Appointment pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 5.71(b)(1)(A), to the Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee:
  - Jun Zhong - term ending August 3, 2027

- (Re)appointments pursuant to Charter, Sections 4.122, to the Youth Commission:
  - Dawnae Quintae Deidre Jacques - term ending September 6, 2026
  - Téa Lonné Amir - term ending September 6, 2026
  - Jacqueline Moreno - term ending September 6, 2026
  - Ayan Azad - term ending September 6, 2026
  - Ava Oram - term ending September 6, 2026
  - Emily Yang - term ending September 6, 2026

From Supervisor Walton, regarding the recommendation to eliminate the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board by the Commission Streamlining Task Force. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Department of Public Health (DPH), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.170-1(H), submitting notices of grant line-item budget revisions in excess of 15%. Copy: Each Supervisor. 3 Notices. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Office of the Mayor (MYR), submitting the State Legislation Committee's July 30, 2025, meeting agenda; approval of positions on legislation before the California State Legislature. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Office of the Controller (CON), submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Jackie Fielder at the July 15, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the Office of the Controller (CON), submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Board President Rafael Mandelman at the February 25, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the San Francisco Arts Commission (ART), submitting a cancellation notice for the Full Arts Commission meeting on August 4, 2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), pursuant to Ordinance No. 298-24, submitting a Semi-Annual Report on City-Funded 100% Affordable Housing Projects for Calendar Year (CY) 2025. File No. 241083. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From the Department of Public Health, submitting an Annual Sole Source Waiver Usage Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2025, pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 67.24; an Annual Sole Source Grant Agreement List for FY 2024-2025, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 21G; and Annual Core Initiatives Contract Reports for FY 2024-2025, pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 21B. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From the San Francisco Arts Commission (ART), submitting a notice of meeting dates for the month of August 2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 96A, submitting a Quarterly Activity and Data Report (QADR) on Stops Data, Use of Force, Crime Victim, and Domestic Violence for First Quarter of 2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From the Office of Small Business, submitting an Annual Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), submitting the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT) July 24, 2025, meeting minutes; and the agenda for the August 14 and August 28, 2025 meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Bilal Mahmood at the July 15, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From the San Francisco International Airport (AIR), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 67.24(e), submitting a Sole Source Contracts Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1(d)(1), submitting approved Chapter 12B Waiver Request Forms. 12 Forms. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From various departments, pursuant to Ordinance No. 10-25, submitting Administrative Code, Chapter 21B, waiver notifications. 2 Forms. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From various departments, pursuant to Chapter 21B.3, Ordinance No. 10-25, and Ordinance No. 38-24, submitting Administrative Code, Chapter 21B, quarterly reports for reporting period 04/01/2025 through 06/30/2025. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From the Office of the Controller (CON), pursuant to Charter, Section 3.105 and Appendix F, and Administrative Code, Chapter 10.6-2, submitting a Recreation and Parks Department (RPD) report on Lifetime Tennis, Inc., dba Lifetime Activities, for the operation and management of the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From the Office of the City Administrator (ADM), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.100-305(c), submitting an Annual Gifts Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From the Recreation and Parks Department (RPD), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.100-305, submitting an Annual Report on Gifts Received up to $10,000 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From the Department of Elections (REG), regarding the September 16, 2025, Special Recall Election to Registered Voters in District 4. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From the Department of Emergency Management (DEM), pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 20, submitting request for extension for annual Street Teams Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From the Office of the City Administrator (ADM), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 23 A6(b), submitting annual update of the City’s surplus property list. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From the Department on the Status of Women (WOM), submitting a Monthly Update on the Status of Abortion Rights for the month of August 2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From the Office of the Treasurer Tax Collector (TTX), pursuant to California State Government Code, Section 53646, submitting the Monthly Pooled Investment Report for the month of July 2025.Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From the Office of the City Attorney (CAT), pursuant to Charter, Section 9.115 and Administrative Code, Section 3.14, submitting Budget Certification Letter for Fiscal Years (FYs) 2025-2026 and 2026-2027. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From the Office of the District Attorney (DAT), pursuant to California Government Code, Section 27388, submitting Real Estate Fraud Annual Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From the Office of the Controller (CON), pursuant to Charter, Section 3.105 and Appendix F, and Administrative Code, Chapter 10.6-2, submitting report on its audit of the agreement between the City and County of San Francisco (City), through its Airport Commission (Airport), and SP Plus SF Joint Venture (SP Plus) for the operation and management of the parking facilities at San Francisco International Airport. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From the Office of the Mayor (MYR), submitting the State Legislation Committee's approval of positions on legislation before the California State Legislature, and approved State Legislation Committee minutes from the August 27, 2025, meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (30)

From the Office of the Controller, submitting report, entitled, “Status of the San Francisco Economy: July 2025”. Copy: Each Supervisor. (31)

From the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting , submitting notices regarding golden mussel, invasive non-native mussels and green crab, to commercial bull kelp harvest restrictions, commercial coonstripe shrimp fishery, recreational take of rockfish, cabezon, greenling, and lingcod, recreational crab fishing gear and commercial passenger fishing vessel (CPFV) validation, the take of Morro manzanita, recreational striped bass harvest size limits, and the agenda for the August 13-14, 2025 California Fish and Game Commission meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (32)

From members of the public, regarding animal welfare in South Korea. 8 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (33)

From members of the public, regarding California Legislature Assembly Bill No. 470 (Telephone Corporations: Carriers of Last Resort) introduced by Assemblymember Tina McKinnor. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (34)

From Howard Chabner, regarding sidewalk conditions in Hayes Valley. Copy: Each Supervisor. (35)

From Dylan Harris, regarding the Webster Street bike lane. Copy: Each Supervisor. (36)

From United to Save the Mission, the San Francisco Latino Task Force, and the San Francisco Latino Parity and Equity Coalition, regarding the Hearing of persons interested in or objecting to the decision of Public Works, dated June 25, 2025, approving a Tentative Parcel Map for a three-lot subdivision at 1979 Mission Street, Assessor's Parcel Block No. 3553, Lot No. 052. (District 9) (Appellant: Ali Gilmore) (Filed: July 3, 2025). File No. 250735. Copy: Each Supervisor. (37)

From Barbara Dwyer, regarding the proposed Motion conditionally disapproving the decision of Public Works and disapproving the Tentative Parcel Map for a three-lot subdivision at 1979 Mission Street, Assessor's Parcel Block No. 3553, Lot No. 052, subject to the Board of Supervisors' adoption of written findings in support of the disapproval. File No. 250737. Copy: Each Supervisor. (38)

From Adrienne Hoyer, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to promote equitable access to shelter and behavioral health services by prohibiting the City from siting a new, City-funded homeless shelter, transitional housing facility, or certain behavioral health residential care and treatment facilities (collectively, "Covered Facilities") in a neighborhood where the neighborhood's share of the City's shelter and transitional housing beds exceeds the neighborhood's share of the City's unsheltered persons, and prohibiting the City from siting a new City-funded homeless shelter within 300 feet of an existing homeless shelter; and authorizing the Board of Supervisors to waive these prohibitions upon a finding that approving the Covered Facility or homeless shelter at the proposed location is in the public interest; and providing that this ordinance shall sunset on December 31, 2031. File No. 250487. Copy: Each Supervisor. (39)

From Christin Evans, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Planning Code to eliminate limits on Non-Residential Use Sizes in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD), Polk Street NCD, West Portal Avenue NCD, North Beach NCD and North Beach Special Use District, Regional Commercial Districts, and Residential-Commercial District. File No. 250634. Copy: Each Supervisor. (40)

From Jonathan Weisman, regarding fireworks. Copy: Each Supervisor. (41)

From Han Lee, regarding San Francisco's Below Market Rate (BMR) housing program. Copy: Each Supervisor. (42)

From Lee Heidhues, regarding grocery store hiring practices. Copy: Each Supervisor. (43)

From Randy Shaw, regarding public comment at Board of Supervisors meetings. Copy: Each Supervisor. (44)

From Allen Jones, regarding a proposed national American heroes garden. Copy: Each Supervisor. (45)

From Kaden Nguyen, regarding affordable housing architecture. Copy: Each Supervisor. (46)

From Lisa Platt, regarding the proposed Resolution urging a preventative, interagency, and data-driven approach to ending severe and fatal traffic crashes by designing and enforcing safer streets for all San Franciscans, with a particular focus on protecting children, seniors, and other vulnerable populations. File No. 250851. Copy: Each Supervisor. (47)

From Jennifer Walsh, regarding the San Francisco Disability Pride Treasure Hunt. Copy: Each Supervisor. (48)

From Sonic Fiber-Optic Internet, regarding overhead crossings of San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) lines. Copy: Each Supervisor. (49)

From Linda Brotemarkle, regarding UN Plaza. Copy: Each Supervisor. (50)

From Jeanine Alexander, regarding construction at the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) Parnassus Campus. Copy: Each Supervisor. (51)

From Chris Ward Kline, regarding various subjects. Copy: Each Supervisor. (52)

From a member of the public, regarding the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD). Copy: Each Supervisor. (53)

From members of the public, regarding the Resolution urging the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) to develop and implement a plan for No Turn On Red (NTOR) at every signalized intersection in San Francisco and approve a citywide NTOR policy. File No. 231016; Resolution No. 481-23. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (54)

From members of the public, 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; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. File No. 250617. Resolution No. 327-25. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (55)

From members of the public, regarding the 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. Ordinance No. 122-25. File No. 250655. 14 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (56)

From members of the public, regarding the Resolution condemning the abduction of immigrants by the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency (ICE) and urging

strict adherence to due process, family unity, and humane treatment of migrants who safely and lawfully pursue their claims. File No. 250661. Resolution No. 296-25. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (57)

From members of the public, regarding the Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan; Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan. File Nos. 250700 and 250701, 252 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (58)

From members of the public, regarding San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) recruitment policies. 16 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (59)

From David Romano, regarding the use of plastic turf in the renovation of the Crocker Amazon baseball fields. Copy: Each Supervisor. (60)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Resolution urging the Police Department and the Department of Emergency Management to designate all 911 calls reporting drug use or suspected drug activity within 1,500 feet of parks, playgrounds, and schools as “Priority A” calls requiring swift and immediate response. File No. 250639. 246 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (61)

From members of the public, regarding the Budget and Appropriation Ordinance appropriating all estimated receipts and all estimated expenditures for Departments of the City and County of San Francisco as of May 30, 2025, for the Fiscal Years (FYs) ending June 30, 2026, and June 30, 2027. File No. 250589. Ordinance No. 119-25. 12 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (62)

From Kathy Porter, regarding ticketed events in Golden Gate Park. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (63)

From members of the public, regarding the Graffiti Abatement Program. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (64)

From members of the public, regarding John F. Kennedy Drive. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (65)

From Julien DeFrance, regarding various subjects. 19 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (66)

From members of the public, regarding lobbying activity in San Francisco government. 43 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (67)

From Michelle Gurlin, regarding a filed Motion amending the Board of Supervisors' Rules of Order by revising Rule 1.3.3 (In-Person and Remote Public Comment) to provide for remote public comment opportunities for members of the public at committee meetings of the Board. File No. 241048. Copy: Each Supervisor. (68)

From members of the public, regarding California State Senate Bill 63 (Wiener, Arreguín), relating to transportation funding. 3 Letters Copy: Each Supervisor. (69)

From members of the public, regarding the installation of a protected bikeway on Valencia Street south of 23rd Street. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (70)

From a member of the public, regarding the closure of the Great Highway. Copy: Each Supervisor. (71)

From Christopher Johnston, 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. Copy: Each Supervisor. (72)

From Kim Forwood, regarding Resolution authorizing the Office of the Mayor, Recreation and Park Department, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, San Francisco International Airport, Office of the City Administrator, and the Chief of Protocol to solicit donations from various private entities and organizations to support San Francisco in hosting Panda Bears from the People’s Republic of China, notwithstanding the Behested Payment Ordinance. File No. 240415. Copy: Each Supervisor. (73)

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. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (74)

From Carmel Spruell, regarding various subjects. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (75)

From members of the public, regarding Resolution opposing California State Senate Bill No. 79, Housing Development: Transit-Oriented Development, introduced by Senator Scott Wiener, and similar future legislation, unless amended to give Local governments adequate ability to formulate local plans through its local legislative process, in which local governments and residents have adequate review and oversight of community planning, including affordability requirements, and residential and commercial tenant protections. File No. 250727. 340 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (76)

From members of the public, regarding Resolution initiating a landmark designation under Article 10 of the Planning Code of The Mint Mall and Hall at 951-957 Mission Street at the south side of Mission Street between 5th and 6th Streets. File No. 250783; Resolution No. 394-25. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (77)

From the San Francisco Apartment Association, regarding Ordinance amending the Planning Code to require applicants to disclose the presence of any Unauthorized

Dwelling Unit, and require the Planning Department to investigate any Unauthorized Dwelling Unit, upon submittal of a Development Application; require the Planning Department to document when a property is subject to a regulatory agreement subjecting any units on the property to the San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance; and require the Planning Department to inspect properties prior to recommending approval of any loss of a Residential Unit or Unauthorized Dwelling Unit; amending the Building Code to expand the Department of Building Inspection's Expanded Compliance Control Program to address fraud, bribery, and failure to accurately represent the presence and number of Unauthorized Dwelling Units at properties subject to a permit application; 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 findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare pursuant to Planning Code, Section 302. File No. 240803. Copy: Each Supervisor. (78)

From CommonSpirit Health, accordance with California Health and Safety Code, Section 130066.5, submitting Structural Performance Category Ratings of Hospital Buildings Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (79)

From Shoshanah Dobry, regarding the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board. Copy: Each Supervisor. (80)

From members of the public, regarding the Department of Police Accountability (DPA). Copy: Each Supervisor. (81)

From a member of the public, regarding traffic enforcement. Copy: Each Supervisor. (82)

From the San Francisco Taxi Workers Alliance, taxi medallion debt relief. Copy: Each Supervisor. (83)

From a member of the public, regarding the shared scooter program. Copy: Each Supervisor. (84)

From Padric J. McCaig, regarding construction projects on Geary Bouevard. Copy: Each Supervisor. (85)

From Maya Keshavan, regarding San Francisco City Guides. Copy: Each Supervisor. (86)

From Thomas L. Adlfinger, regarding the Justice Information Tracking System (JUSTIS). Copy: Each Supervisor. (87)

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: August 26, 2025

To: Members, Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Mayoral Renomination - Building Inspection Commission

On August 21, 2025, the Office of the Mayor submitted the following renomination package. Pursuant to Charter, Section 4.121, this renomination shall be subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors at a public hearing and vote within 60 days (October 20, 2025).

Renomination to the Building Inspection Commission:

- **Bianca Neumann** - term ending July 1, 2027

If the Board fails to act on the renomination within 60 days from the date the Notice of Appointment was received by the Clerk of the Board, the reappointment shall be deemed approved.

Pursuant to Board Rule 2.18.1, the Clerk of the Board shall refer the Motion to the Rules Committee and work with the Rules Committee Chair to schedule this renomination for a hearing.

c: President Rafael Mandelman - Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Shamann Walton - Chair, Rules Committee, Board of Supervisors
Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy
Victor Young - Rules Clerk
Brad Russi - Deputy City Attorney
Adam Thongsavat - Mayor's Liaison to the Board of Supervisors
Andre Adeyemi - Mayor's Director of Appointments

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

Notice of Renomination

August 21, 2025

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Charter Section 4.121, of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following renomination:

Bianca Neumann to the Building Inspection Commission (Seat 1) for the unexpired portion of a two-year term ending July 1, 2027.

I am confident that Ms. Neumann will serve our community well. Attached are her qualifications, which reflect how her renomination represents the City's communities of interest, neighborhoods, and diverse populations.

If you have any questions, please contact my Director of Appointments, Andre Adeyemi, at (415) 554-4000.

Sincerely,

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: August 26, 2025

To: Members, Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Mayoral Appointment - Human Rights Commission

On August 21, 2025, the Office of the Mayor submitted the following complete appointment package pursuant to Charter, Sections 3.100(18) and 4.107. This appointment is effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (September 20, 2025).

Appointment to the Human Rights Commission:

- Monroe Lace - term ending September 2, 2028

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

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

If you wish to hold a hearing on this appointment, please let me know in writing by noon on Wednesday, September 3, 2025.

c: President Rafael Mandelman - Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Shamann Walton - Chair, Rules Committee, Board of Supervisors
Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy Director
Victor Young - Rules Clerk
Brad Russi - Deputy City Attorney
Adam Thongsavat - Mayor's Liaison to the Board of Supervisors
Andre Adeyemi - Mayor's Director of Appointments

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

August 21, 2025

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to charter Section 3.100(18), (Charter § 4.107), of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following appointment:

Monroe Lace to the San Francisco Human Rights Commission for the unexpired portion of a four-year term ending on September 2, 2028 (replacing Rodrigo Duran - resigned).

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

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of this appointment. Should you have any questions, please contact my Director of Appointments, Andre Adeyemi, at (415) 554-4000.

Sincerely,

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

August 26, 2025

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to (Admin. Code § 5.71(b)(1)(A)), of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following appointment to the Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee:

Jun Zhong - Seat 5 (replacing Paris Mason - resigned) for the unfinished portion of a two-year term ending August 3, 2027.

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

Should you have any questions about this appointment, please contact my Director of Appointments, Andre Adeyemi, at (415) 554-4000.

Sincerely,

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

August 26, 2025

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 5.201 of the City and County of San Francisco, I hereby submit the following appointment:

Appointment of Hessah AlJiran to the Immigrant Rights Commission, Seat 15, for a term ending June 6, 2026, replacing Victor Qui (term expired).

I am confident that Hessah will serve our community with distinction. Attached are her qualifications, which demonstrate how her appointment reflects the communities of interest, neighborhoods, and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

Should you have any questions regarding this appointment, please contact my Director of Appointments, Andre Adeyemi, at (415) 554-4000.

Sincerely,

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

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

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

August 15, 2025

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 4.122 of the City and County of San Francisco, I hereby submit the following:

Appointment of Dawnae Quintae Deidre Jacques to the Youth Commission, Seat 3, for a term ending September 6, 2026, replacing Jason Fong (term expired).

Reappointment of Téa Lonné Amir to the Youth Commission, Seat 6, for a term ending September 6, 2026.

Appointment of Jacqueline Moreno to the Youth Commission, Seat 9, for a term ending September 6, 2026, replacing Eloise Krehlik (term expired).

Appointment of Ayan Azad to the Youth Commission, Seat 12, for a term ending September 6, 2026, replacing Aisha Majdoub (term expired).

Reappointment of Ava Oram to the Youth Commission, Seat 13, for a term ending September 6, 2026.

Reappointment of Emily Yang to the Youth Commission, Seat 16, for a term ending September 6, 2026.

I am confident that they will serve our community with distinction. Their appointment reflects the diverse communities, neighborhoods, and populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

Should you have any questions regarding this appointment, please contact my Director of Appointments, Andre Adeyemi, at (415) 554-4000.

Sincerely,

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

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

Item 2

From:	Gee, Natalie (BOS)
To:	commissionstreamlining; Hayward, Sophie (ADM); Mihal, Natasha (CON); BRUSS, ANDREA (CAT)
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chu, Carmen (ADM); BOS-Supervisors; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); SDA-Sheriff Department Oversight Board; Soo, Julie (SDA); Leung, Dan (SDA); Thongsavat, Adam (MYR); Afuhaamango, Ovava (SDA); Allen, Sydney (SDA); Carrion, Xochitl (SDA); Nataly Ortiz, Estela (SDA); Palmer II, William (SDA); Henderson, Paul (DPA); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Gallardo, Tracy (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Supervisor Walton"s Letter Re: Strongly Opposing the Elimination of SDOB
Date:	Tuesday, August 19, 2025 3:08:43 PM
Attachments:	Sup Walton - Letter Opposing Elimination of SDOB.pdf

Please see the corrected version. Thank you.

Natalie Gee 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff
Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 279
Direct: 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670
District 10 Community Events Calendar: https://bit.ly/d10communityevents

---

From: Gee, Natalie (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 3:07 PM
To: commissionstreamlining <commissionstreamlining@sfgov.org>; Hayward, Sophie (ADM) <sophie.hayward@sfgov.org>; Mihal, Natasha (CON) <natasha.mihal@sfgov.org>; BRUSS, ANDREA (CAT) <Andrea.Bruss@sfcityatty.org>
Cc: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Chu, Carmen (ADM) <carmen.chu@sfgov.org>; BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; SDA-Sheriff Department Oversight Board <SDOB@sfgov.org>; Soo, Julie (SDA) <Julie.Soo@sfgov.org>; Leung, Dan (SDA) <dan.leung@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Afuhaamango, Ovava (SDA) <ovava.e.afuhaamango@sfgov.org>; Allen, Sydney (SDA) <sydney.allen@sfgov.org>; Carrion, Xochitl (SDA) <xochitl.carrion@sfgov.org>; Nataly Ortiz, Estela (SDA) <estela.natalyortiz@sfgov.org>; Palmer II, William (SDA) <william.palmerii@sfgov.org>; Henderson, Paul (DPA) <paul.henderson@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Gallardo, Tracy (BOS) <tracy.gallardo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Subject: Supervisor Walton's Letter Re: Strongly Opposing the Elimination of SDOB

Dear Members of the Commission Streamlining Task Force,

Please see Supervisor Shamann Walton's letter opposing the Commission Streamlining Task Force recommendation to eliminate the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board. Please reach out if you have any questions or would like further discussion with Supervisor Walton.

Thank you,
Natalie

Natalie Gee 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff
Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 279

Direct: 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670
District 10 Community Events Calendar: https://bit.ly/d10communityevents

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 10

City and County of San Francisco

SHAMANN WALTON
華頌善

August 19, 2025

TO: Commission Streamlining Task Force
Sophie Hayward, Member, City Administrator's Office
Natasha Mihal, Member, Controller's Office
Andrea Bruss, Member, City Attorney's Office
Ed Harrington, Member, Public Sector Labor Representative, BOS Designee
Jean Fraser, Member, CEO of Presidio Trust/Mayor's Designee

RE: Strongly Opposing the Recommendation to Eliminate the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board

Dear Members of the Commission Streamlining Task Force,

I am writing to strongly oppose the recommendation to eliminate the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board (SDOB) by the Commission Streamlining Task Force.

The Sheriff's Department Oversight Board was created by San Francisco voters in 2020 through Proposition D, a charter amendment, passing with nearly 67% approval. Voters demanded accountability and transparency because of repeated incidents inside our jails that raised deep concerns about abuse and mismanagement.

This commission was not established on a theoretical basis. We have seen cases of "fight-clubs" in the jail where deputies were accused of forcing incarcerated people to fight each other for entertainment prior to proposing this measure. We have seen disturbing in-custody deaths, excessive use of force, and other serious breakdowns in safety and accountability under the Sheriff's watch. These are not isolated problems, and they underscore why independent oversight is necessary.

The Sheriff's Department Oversight Board provides the public with a direct line of accountability, shining light on a department that operates behind closed doors. Removing it would not only undermine the will of the voters but also strip away a safeguard that helps prevent abuse and restores trust between the community and law enforcement.

According to City Charter §14.101, any initiative or Charter amendment "shall not be subject to veto, or to amendment or repeal except by the voters, unless such initiative or declaration of policy shall otherwise provide." Since the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board was created by the Charter, the only way to eliminate it is by amending the Charter, which requires voter approval. Proposition D, approved by voters in November 2020, added Charter §4.137, which

City Hall • 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place • Room 244 • San Francisco, California 94102-4689 • (415) 554-7670
Fax (415) 554-7674 • TDD/TTY (415) 554-5227 • E-mail: Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

formally established the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board (SDOB) and defined its composition, powers, duties, and investigative authority. Eliminating this voter-approved body would not only strip away a critical safeguard for accountability, it would also directly contradict the clear will of the people of San Francisco.

At a time when transparency and accountability are more critical than ever, removing the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board would be a step backwards. For these reasons, I strongly urge you to reject the Task Force's recommendation and preserve the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

CC: Mayor Daniel Lurie
Carmen Chu, City Administrator
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Sheriff's Department Oversight Board
Paul Henderson, Director, Police of Police Accountability

City Hall • 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place • Room 244 • San Francisco, California 94102-4689 • (415) 554-7670
Fax (415) 554-7674 • TDD/TTY (415) 554-5227 • E-mail: Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

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: Grant Budget Revision - Grant name: WIC
Date:	Friday, July 25, 2025 1:29:50 PM
Attachments:	A03 Line Item Shift Request Workbook -Overall_Approved.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached communication from the San Francisco Department of Public Health, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.170-1(H), regarding a grant line item budget revision in excess of 15% requiring funding agency approval.

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: Yu, Peter (DPH) <peter.j.yu@sfdph.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2025 4:02 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Quinonez, Miguel (DPH) <miguel.quinonez@sfdph.org>
Subject: Grant Budget Revision - Grant name: WIC

Hello,

In accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.170-1(H), this memo serves to notify the Board of Supervisors of a (type Federal or State) grant line item budget revision in excess of 15% requiring funding agency approval.

We have attached a copy of budget revision documentation submitted to the funding agency.

Attachment: Budget revision documentation

Thanks,

Peter Yu
San Francisco Department of Public Health
Accounting - Grants
1380 Howard Street, #408c
San Francisco, CA 94103
Email: Peter.J.Yu@sfdph.org

Docusign Envelope ID: 63D377B8-B093-4572-B9F4-785798DBF1F7

LINE ITEM SHIFT REQUEST
FFY 2025 Contract Year 3

Local Agency Name	Date of Request
City and County of San Francisco	July 2, 2025
Proposed Effective Date	**Contract Number**
October 1, 2024	22-10282 A03

BUDGET LINE ITEMS	CURRENT APPROVED BUDGET	LINE ITEM SHIFT *Negative amt shown in ( )*	REVISED BUDGET
Personnel	$2,842,073	($142,000)	$2,700,073
Total Salaries, Wages, and Overtime	$1,950,618	($142,000)	$1,808,618
Total Fringe Benefits	$891,455	$0	$891,455
Operating Expenses	$250,594	$0	$250,594
General Expenses	$190,594	$0	$190,594
Travel	$20,000	$0	$20,000
Training	$20,000	$0	$20,000
Outreach/Media/Promotion	$20,000	$0	$20,000
Facility Costs	$0	$0	$0
Capital Expenditures	$0	$0	$0
Equipment	$0	$0	$0
Vehicle(s)	$0	$0	$0
Other Costs	$0	$0	$0
Indirect Costs	$142,000	$142,000	$284,000
Total Budget	**$3,234,667**	**$0**	**$3,234,667**

APPROVAL OF A LINE ITEM SHIFT DOES NOT CONSTITUTE APPROVAL OF EXPENDITURE

DocuSigned by: Pyloul Pokrovo 142006282BEB48B...	07/09/2025 | 11:11 AM PDT
Agency Director / Designee Electronic Signature	**Date**
Priti Rane	7-2-2025
WIC Director / Designee Electronic Signature	**Date**
Priti Rane	7-2-2025
Prepared By: (Print Name)	**Date**

For State Use Only		
☐ APPROVED		
☐ NOT APPROVED	CDPH/WIC Authorized Electronic Signature Date	CDPH/WIC Authorized Electronic Signature Date

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: Grant Budget Revision - Grant name: Nutrition Network Project
Date:	Thursday, July 24, 2025 4:28:57 PM
Attachments:	City and County of San Francisco 2025 Budget Export.xlsx

Hello,

Please see below and attached communication from the San Francisco Department of Public Health, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.170-1(H), regarding a grant line item budget revision in excess of 15% requiring funding agency approval.

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: Yu, Peter (DPH) <peter.j.yu@sfdph.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2025 4:02 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Quinonez, Miguel (DPH) <miguel.quinonez@sfdph.org>
Subject: Grant Budget Revision - Grant name: Nutrition Network Project

Hello,

In accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.170-1(H), this memo serves to notify the Board of Supervisors of a (type Federal or State) grant line item budget revision in excess of 15% requiring funding agency approval.

We have attached a copy of budget revision documentation submitted to the funding agency.

Attachment: Budget revision documentation

Thanks,

Peter Yu
San Francisco Department of Public Health
Accounting - Grants
1380 Howard Street, #408c
San Francisco, CA 94103
Email: Peter.J.Yu@sfdph.org

Budget Name	Budget Agency	Budget Type	Contract Number	Budget Number	Budget Date	Modified Date	FFY 2024 Carry-In Amount	FFY 2025 Award Amount	FFY 2025 Total Budget Amount
City and County of San Francisco Budget 2025	City and County of San Francisco	LIA		2025-2-*-*-4348	12/21/2023 11:38:40 AM	7/21/2025 9:03:08 AM	$167,154.75	$836,772.00	$1,003,926.75

Row #	Expenses	FFY 2024 Budget	FFY 2024 Carry-In Budget	FFY 2025 Budget	FFY 2024 Carry-In and FFY 2025 Budget Total	% Difference	Justification for Greater than 5 % Difference from FFY 2025 Budget
1	1) Salaries/Benefits	$544,605.60	$64,841.39	$602,824.26	$667,665.65	10.69%	Changes in FTE and staff salaries
2	2) Travel	$16,312.04	$2,477.56	$10,082.09	$12,559.65	-38.19%	Updated travel rates
3	3) Non-Capital Equipment/Supplies	$10,329.64	$0.00	$14,979.42	$14,979.42	45.01%	Updated supplies needed
4	4) Materials	$19,460.75	$0.00	$18,512.22	$18,512.22	-4.87%	Increase in materials needed
5	5) Building/Space	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00%	
6	6) Maintenance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00%	
7	7) Equipment and Other Capital Expenditures	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00%	
8	8) Contracts/Sub-Grants/ Agreements	$150,000.00	$0.00	$150,000.03	$150,000.03	0.00%	Increase in funding to subcontractor
9	**9) Total Direct Costs**	**$740,708.03**	**$67,318.95**	**$796,398.02**	**$863,716.97**	**7.52%**	
10	10) Indirect Cost Rate	$96,063.98	$99,835.80	$40,373.99	$140,209.79	-57.97%	Indirect was reduced
X	**Total Federal Funds**	**$836,772.00**	**$167,154.75**	**$836,772.00**	**$1,003,926.75**	**0.00%**	

X	Position Title	Staff Name	Time Spent on Mgmt./Admin	Time Spent on Direct Delivery	FTE Rate	Annual Salary	Total Funded Salary	Benefit Rate	Total Funded Benefits	Total Admin. Costs	Total Funded Salary and Benefits	FFY 2024 Carry-In Amount	FFY 2025 Award Amount
1	Project Director	Christopher Chau	70.00%	30.00%	1.000	$146,969.64	$146,969.64	45.000%	$66,136.34	$149,174.18	$213,105.98	$0.00	$213,105.98
2	Project Lead	Danielle Lundstrom	30.00%	70.00%	0.975	$124,000.00	$120,900.00	46.500%	$56,218.50	$53,135.55	$177,118.50	$0.00	$177,118.50
3	Nutritionist	Luana Mears	20.00%	80.00%	0.900	$122,000.00	$109,800.00	45.000%	$49,410.00	$31,842.00	$159,210.00	$0.00	$159,210.00
4	Nutrition Services Director	Priti Rane (in-kind)	0.00%	0.00%	0.000	$0.00	$0.00	0.000%	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5	Health worker III	Rolando Rodriguez	10.00%	90.00%	0.800	$95,000.01	$76,000.01	45.000%	$34,200.00	$11,020.00	$110,200.01	$64,841.39	$45,358.62
6	Public health nutrition intern	Indira D'Souza	0.00%	100.00%	1.000	$2,007.79	$2,007.79	0.000%	$0.00	$0.00	$2,007.79	$0.00	$2,007.79
7	Public health nutrition intern	TBD	0.00%	100.00%	1.000	$2,007.79	$2,007.79	0.000%	$0.00	$0.00	$2,007.79	$0.00	$2,007.79
8	Public health nutrition intern	TBD	0.00%	100.00%	1.000	$2,007.79	$2,007.79	0.000%	$0.00	$0.00	$2,007.79	$0.00	$2,007.79
9	Public health nutrition intern	TBD	0.00%	100.00%	1.000	$2,007.79	$2,007.79	0.000%	$0.00	$0.00	$2,007.79	$0.00	$2,007.79
X			**16.25%**	**83.75%**	**7.675**		**$461,700.81**		**$205,964.84**	**$245,171.74**	**$667,665.65**	**$64,841.39**	**$602,824.26**

Row #	Position Name and Title	Presenter?	Travel Title	Travel Location	Description and Justification	Trips	FTE	Days	Nights	Per Diem	Lodging	Air	Miles	Mileage Rate	Registration Fee	Other	Total	FFY 2024 Carry-In Amount	FFY 2025 Award Amount
1	Christopher Chau : Project Director Danielle Lundstrom : Project Lead Luana Mears : Nutritionist Rolando Rodriguez : Health worker III	No	Local travel	San Francisco and surrounding counties	Local travel for staff attending meetings and events in surrounding areas.	30.000	5.000	0.000	0.000	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	501	$0.670	$0.00	$0.00	$10,062.26	$0.00	$10,062.26
X																	**$10,062.26**	**$0.00**	**$10,062.26**

Row #	Position Name and Title	Presenter?	Travel Title	Travel Location	Description and Justification	Trips	FTE	Days	Nights	Per Diem	Lodging	Air	Miles	Mileage Rate	Registration Fee	Other	Total	FFY 2024 Carry-In Amount	FFY 2025 Award Amount
2	Danielle Lundstrom : Project Lead	No	FNCE	Minneapolis, MN	FNCE- Conference sharing/highlighting outcomes-based interventions in various educational tracks including Public Health with the resources needed to quickly apply new learnings into practice. Covers a significant number of community nutrition topics, to apply to CFHL programs.	1.000	1.000	5.000	4.000	$59.00	$200.00	$599.00	0	$0.670	$750.00	$53.39	$2,497.39	$2,477.56	$19.83
X																	**$2,497.39**	**$2,477.56**	**$19.83**

Row #	Budget Item	Description and Justificaion	FTE	Cost Per Item	# of Items	Total	FFY 2024 Carry-In Amount	FFY 2025 Award Amount
1	Office Supplies	This includes paper, pens, folders, printer cartridges used 100% for SNAP-Ed funded purposes. Quantity is budgeted FTE for prime staff.	4.08	$167.89	18	$12,314.73	$0.00	$12,314.73
3	Postage/Shipping Costs	This is used to submit reports, send information to the State and communicate as needed with sub-contractors, as well as local and regional partners.	4.08	$10.00	12	$489.00	$0.00	$489.00
4	Other (Please describe in Description and Justification)	Canva-Graphic design tool website for our program's class and event flyers	4.08	$4.23	12	$206.85	$0.00	$206.85
X						**$13,010.58**	**$0.00**	**$13,010.58**

Row #	Budget Item	Position Name and Title	Description and Justification	FTE	Cost Per Item	# of Items	Total	FFY 2024 Carry-In Amount	FFY 2025 Award Amount
2	Laptop Computer	Christopher Chau : Project Director	Ergo laptop and accessories: Dell Precision Intel Core Ultra Pro 15.6 -16GB 512GB. Dell Thunderbelt docking station with required locking station. Cost per items also includes shipping, taxes, and fees. Cost Comparison in documents.	1.00	$1,968.84	1	$1,968.84	$0.00	$1,968.84
X							**$1,968.84**	**$0.00**	**$1,968.84**

Row #	Budget Item	Description and Justification	Cost Per Item	# of Items	Total	FFY 2024 Carry-In Amount	FFY 2025 Award Amount
1	Food Demonstration Materials	Food for demonstration/taste test only at Classes and Events,	$4.50	2,207	$9,931.50	$0.00	$9,931.50
2	Other (Please describe in Description and Justification)	Survey Monkey-This service will allow us to survey our community partners and to evaluate how our services are being utilized and the impact it is having on the food, beverage and physical activity practices of their clients and staff. It will also allow us to evaluate our Policy, Systems, and Environment activities.	$44.22	12	$530.64	$0.00	$530.64
3	Other (Please describe in Description and Justification)	Project management software such as Asana to help the team collaborate and complete deliverables in a timely manner	$83.34	12	$1,000.08	$0.00	$1,000.08
4	Venue and Event Materials	CFHL branded materials such as tablecloth, banners	$100.00	40	$4,000.00	$0.00	$4,000.00
5	Educational Curriculum & Materials	Purchase SNAP ED approved curriculum and training for school setting for 5 schools. Curricula, materials and equipment necessary to conduct nutrition and PA education and training in K-5 setting (i.e Healthy and education journey package includes Health Education and Physical Education curricula, as well as the CATCH Coordination Kits $600/ each)	$600.00	5	$3,000.00	$0.00	$3,000.00
6	Food Safety	Food handlers certification for all staff to ensure all staff is trained in proper food handling methods during training and classes	$10.00	5	$50.00	$0.00	$50.00
X					**$18,512.22**	**$0.00**	**$18,512.22**

Row #	Building Type	Location Name	Address	Calculation Description	FTE	Cost Per Month	# of Months	Total	FFY 2024 Carry-In Amount	FFY 2025 Award Amount
X								$0.00	$0.00	$0.00

Row #	Maintenance Type	Location Name	Address	Calculation Description	FTE	Cost Per Month	# of Months	Total	FFY 2024 Carry-In Amount	FFY 2025 Award Amount
X								$0.00	$0.00	$0.00

Row #	Budget Item	Description and Justification	FTE	Cost Per Item	# of Items	Misc.	Total	FFY 2024 Carry-In Amount	FFY 2025 Award Amount
X							$0.00	$0.00	$0.00

Row #	Organization Name	Description of Services	Total Grant	FFY 2024 Carry-In Amount	FFY 2025 Award Amount
X			$0.00	$0.00	$0.00

Row #	Organization Name	Description of Services	Total Grant	FFY 2024 Carry-In Amount	FFY 2025 Award Amount
1	Childrens Council	Early Childhood and Child Healthcare Providers - Policy, Systems and Environment work to improve nutrition and physical activity environments in Early Childhood Settings	$150,000.03	$0.00	$150,000.03
X			**$150,000.03**	**$0.00**	**$150,000.03**

Row #	Budget Option	Direct Cost Categories	Indirect Cost Rate	Calculation Method	Total Admin./Program Amount	Total	FFY 2024 Carry-In Amount	FFY 2025 Award Amount
1	Manual Entry		21.000%	21% of personnel - hiring freeze	$667,665.65	$140,209.79	$99,835.80	$40,373.99
X					**$667,665.65**	**$140,209.79**	**$99,835.80**	**$40,373.99**

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: Grant Budget Revision - Grant name: Immunization Cooperative Agreements
Date:	Friday, August 1, 2025 10:55:43 AM
Attachments:	4. R3, R4_Budget revision approved 7.9.25.XLS FW San Francisco Expenditures.msg

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Department of Public Health, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.170-1(H), submitting a notice of a Federal grant line item budget revision in excess of 15% requiring funding agency approval.

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: Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 4:32 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Grant Budget Revision - Grant name: Immunization Cooperative Agreements

Hello,

In accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.170-1(H), this memo serves to notify the Board of Supervisors of a Federal grant line item budget revision in excess of 15% requiring funding agency approval.

We have attached a copy of budget revision documentation submitted to the funding agency.

Attachment: Budget revision documentation

Thank you,

Sharon Z.
Fiscal Unit - Grants
San Francisco Dept. of Public Health
1380 Howard St.

San Francisco, CA 94103

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use, or distribution of the information included in this message and any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me by e-mail and immediately and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

City and County of San Francisco
Grant# 22-11052

CDPH Immunization COVID-19 Carryover Funding Round 2
Fund Year: July 1, 2024 - June 30, 2025

Budget Detail

I. Personnel	**% of time or hours on project**	**Monthly salary range or hourly rate**		**Total**
			$	-
			$	-
			$	-
			$	-
			$	-
			$	-
			$	-
			$	-
			$	-
			$	-
			$	-
Total Personnel Expenses			$	-
II. Fringe Benefits (___% of Personnel)			$	-
III. Operating Expenses or General Expenses			$	20,524.16
Office/Clinic Supplies			$	20,524.16
Printing			$	-
Health Education			$	-
Other (itemize)			$	-
IV. Equipment Expenses			$	-
			$	-
V. Travel Expenses			$	-
In-State Travel			$	-
Out-of-State Travel			$	-
(The Grantee shall be reimbursed for actuals claimed and invoiced)				
VI. Subgrantee Expenses (if any)			$	-
_____ (Name of Subgrantee)				
VII. Indirect Costs (Approved __% of total Personnel Costs or total Direct Costs)			$	-
☐ Approved ___% of total Personnel Costs OR				
☐ Approved ___% of total Direct Costs				
VIII. Total Expenses for COVID-19 Carryover Funding Round 2			**$**	**20,524.16**

City and County of San Francisco
Grant# 22-11052

CDPH Immunization COVID-19 Carryover Funding Round 3
Fund Year: July 1, 2024 - June 30, 2025

Budget Detail

I. Personnel	**% of time or hours on project**	**Monthly salary range or hourly rate**	**Total**
Nurse Practitioner (2328) - Elizabeth Abaunza	100%	$ 16,608.00	$ 199,296.00
Public Health Nurse (2830) - Katherine Hernandez	0%	$ 17,938.00	$ -
Senior Physician Specialist (2232) - David Stier	86%	$ 16,608.00	$ 170,592.00
Health Worker II (2586) - Wesley Zhu	0%	$ 7,178.00	$ -
Health Worker III (2587) - Tina Milton	100%	$ 6,880.00	$ 82,560.00
Health Program Coordinator I (2589) - Tina Milton	100%	$ 8,582.00	$ 12,873.00
Health Worker IV (2588) - Rachell Evans	74%	$ 9,182.00	$ 81,657.36
Special Nurse (P103, 2320) - Nicole Copeland	100%	$ 16,608.00	$ 199,296.00
Registered Nurse (2320) - Timothy Hunt	0%	$ 17,938.00	$ -
			$ -
			$ -
Total Personnel Expenses			$ 746,274.00
II. Fringe Benefits (35% of Personnel)			$ 261,288.52
III. Operating Expenses or General Expenses			$ 122,612.38
Office/Clinic Supplies			$ -
Office Rent			$ 31,474.00
Contractor for Program Administration & Support Services			$ 91,138.38
Soliant Registry Pharmacist			$ -
IV. Equipment Expenses			$ 231,765.16
Standalone battery backup packs			$ 231,765.16
V. Travel Expenses			$ -
In-State Travel			$ -
Out-of-State Travel			$ -
(The Grantee shall be reimbursed for actuals claimed and invoiced)			
VI. Subgrantee Expenses (if any)			$ -
_____ (Name of Subgrantee)			
VII. Indirect Costs (Approved 22.462% of total Personnel Costs or total Direct Costs)			$ 226,319.00
☐ Approved 22.462% of total Personnel Costs OR			$ 226,319.00
☐ Approved ___% of total Direct Costs			
VIII. Total Expenses for COVID-19 Carryover Funding Round 3			**$ 1,588,259.06**

City and County of San Francisco
Grant# 22-11052

CDPH Immunization COVID-19 Carryover Funding Round 4
Fund Year: July 1, 2024 - June 30, 2025

Budget Detail

I. Personnel	**% of time or hours on project**	**Monthly salary range or hourly rate**		**Total**
Health Worker I (2585) - Raquel Martinez	15%	$6,413.00	$	11,543.40
Health Worker III (2587) - Shi-Cheng Fang	39%	$7,854.00	$	36,688.86
Health Program Coordinator I (2589) - Ivy Eng	31%	$9,315.00	$	34,282.93
Health Program Coordinator II (2591) - Kacy Diouf 100%	100%	$10,602.00	$	41,506.83
Health Program Coordinator III (2593) - Hallie Randel-Schreiber 100%, Nikkie Ho 50%	75%	$11,869.00	$	213,642.00
Registered Nurse (P103, 2320) - Robin Allen-Contreras	95%	$16,608.00	$	189,331.20
Nurse Manager (2322) - Joseph Clement	23%	$16,608.00	$	46,236.67
Pharmacist (2450) - Yewande Samuel	0%	$17,609.00	$	-
Special Nurse (P103, 2320) - Lisa Watson	95%	$16,608.00	$	189,331.20
Total Personnel Expenses			$	762,563.00
II. Fringe Benefits (35% of Personnel)			$	266,897.77
III. Operating Expenses or General Expenses			$	221,479.31
Office/Clinic Supplies			$	-
Office Rent			$	31,474.00
Contractor for Program Administration & Support Services			$	190,005.31
Other (itemize)			$	-
IV. Equipment Expenses			$	-
Pharmacy-grade refrigerators or freezers			$	-
V. Travel Expenses			$	-
In-State Travel			$	-
Training			$	-
(The Grantee shall be reimbursed for actuals claimed and invoiced)				
VI. Subgrantee Expenses (if any)			$	-
_____ (Name of Subgrantee)				
VII. Indirect Costs (Approved 22.462% of total Personnel Costs or total Direct Costs)			$	231,237.00
☐ Approved 22.462% of total Personnel Costs OR			$	231,237.00
☐ Approved ___% of total Direct Costs				
VIII. Total Expenses for COVID-19 Carryover Funding Round 4			**$**	**1,482,177.08**

IMMUNIZATION BRANCH
LOCAL ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT BUDGET MODIFICATION

DATE: 7/8/2025

COUNTY: San Franisco

CDPH GRANT AGREEMENT NUMBER: #22-11052 COVID-19, R3

PERIOD OF LAST INVOICE SUBMITTED: Q3 1/1/25-3/31/25

PERIOD TO BE COVERED BY THIS MODIFICATION: FY24/25

FISCAL YEAR: 2024-25

	APPROVED BUDGET FY 2024-25	PROPOSED CHANGES	REVISED BUDGET
I. PERSONNEL	$ 581,264.00	$165,010.00	**$ 746,274.00**
II. FRINGE BENEFITS (35%)	$ 203,442.00	$57,847.00	**$ 261,289.00**
III. OPERATING EXPENSES OR GENERAL EXPENSES	$ 395,292.00	($272,680.00)	**$ 122,612.00**
IV. EQUIPMENT	$ 232,000.00	($235.00)	**$ 231,765.00**
V. TRAVEL EXPENSES	$ -	$0.00	**$ -**
VI. SUBGRANTEE	$ -	$0.00	**$ -**
VII. INDIRECT COSTS (22.462%)	$ 176,261.00	$50,058.00	**$ 226,319.00**
TOTAL	$ 1,588,259.00	$0.00	**$ 1,588,259.00**

JUSTIFICATION:
SFDPH is requesting to move funding from the 'Operating expenses or general expenses' and 'Equipment' lines to the 'personnel', 'fringe', and 'indirect costs' categories. The temporary grant termination disrupted our spending plans for the 'operating expenses' category and so we needed to pivot. The equipment amount has been adjusted to reflect the actual cost of the completed equipment purchase. The fringe benefit rate was raised to 35% and the indirect cost rate was raised to 22.462% to bring those rates in line with DPH standards. Calculations and justification for these rates are available if requested.

Signed by:
Elijah Saunders
C0AA8EC804954FD...

County Authorized Signature

7/8/2025
Date

APPROVED BY:

Noemi Marin

Noemi Marin, Chief
Operation Support Section
Immunization Branch

07/09/2025
Date

IMMUNIZATION BRANCH
LOCAL ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT BUDGET MODIFICATION

DATE: 7/8/2025

COUNTY: San Franisco

CDPH GRANT AGREEMENT NUMBER: #22-11052 COVID-19, R4

PERIOD OF LAST INVOICE SUBMITTED: Q3 1/1/25-3/31/25

PERIOD TO BE COVERED BY THIS MODIFICATION: FY24/25

FISCAL YEAR: 2024-25

	APPROVED BUDGET FY 2024-25	PROPOSED CHANGES	REVISED BUDGET
I. PERSONNEL	$ 681,537.00	$81,026.00	**$ 762,563.00**
II. FRINGE BENEFITS (35%)	$ 238,538.00	$28,360.00	**$ 266,898.00**
III. OPERATING EXPENSES OR GENERAL EXPENSES	$ 314,011.00	($92,532.00)	**$ 221,479.00**
IV. EQUIPMENT	$ 26,534.00	($26,534.00)	**$ -**
V. TRAVEL EXPENSES	$ 14,890.00	($14,890.00)	**$ -**
VI. SUBGRANTEE	$ -	$0.00	**$ -**
VII. INDIRECT COSTS (22.462%)	$ 206,667.00	$24,570.00	**$ 231,237.00**
TOTAL	$ 1,482,177.00	$0.00	**$ 1,482,177.00**

JUSTIFICATION:
SFDPH is requesting to move funding from the 'Operating expenses or general expenses', 'Equipment', and 'Travel' categories to the personnel, fringe, and indirect costs categories. The grant termination disrupted our spending plans for the 'operating expenses' and 'equipment' categories and so we needed to pivot. San Francisco's new mayor instituted a travel restriction for all City staff and so we have been unable to send staff to conferences and trainings as planned. The fringe benefit rate was raised to 35% and the indirect cost rate was raised to 22.462% to bring those rates in line with DPH standards. Calculations and justification for these rates are available if requested.

Elijah Saunders

County Authorized Signature

7/8/2025

Date

APPROVED BY:

Noemi Marin

Noemi Marin, Chief
Operation Support Section
Immunization Branch

07/09/2025

Date

From: Kwong, Amanda (DPH)
To: Zeng, Sharon (DPH)
Subject: FW: San Francisco Expenditures
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 2:48:33 PM
Attachments: image001.png
BM Q4 R4.pdf
BM Q4 R3.pdf
FYC4A6~1.XLS

Hi Sharon,

Attached are the approved budget for PD29. Please proceed to process JE for the charges.

Thanks,
Amanda

From: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 1:43 PM
To: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>; Fortunka, Michael@CDPH <Michael.Fortunka@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH IZB Admin <izb.admin@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Kwong, Amanda (DPH) <amanda.kwong@sfdph.org>; Marin, Noemi@CDPH <Noemi.Marin@cdph.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: San Francisco Expenditures

Hi Elijah,

BMs have been approved. Please find attached.

Thanks

Confidential - Low

From: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:37 AM
To: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>; Fortunka, Michael@CDPH <Michael.Fortunka@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH IZB Admin <izb.admin@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Kwong, Amanda (SAN FRANCISCO) <Amanda.Kwong@sfdph.org>; Marin, Noemi@CDPH <Noemi.Marin@cdph.ca.gov>
Subject: Re: San Francisco Expenditures

Hi Rodolfo,

Please find updated R3 form attached.

Thank you!
Elijah

From: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:12 AM
To: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>; Fortunka, Michael@CDPH <Michael.Fortunka@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH IZB Admin <izb.admin@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Kwong, Amanda (DPH) <amanda.kwong@sfdph.org>; Marin, Noemi@CDPH <Noemi.Marin@cdph.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: San Francisco Expenditures

Hi Elijah,

R3 BM appears to be missing justification for moving $235 from Equipment. Please see below. Can you provide that before I send the R3 BM to Noemi for final review?



Thanks!

Confidential - Low

From: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 2:03 PM
To: Fortunka, Michael@CDPH <Michael.Fortunka@cdph.ca.gov>; Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH IZB Admin <izb.admin@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Kwong, Amanda (SAN FRANCISCO) <Amanda.Kwong@sfdph.org>; Marin, Noemi@CDPH <Noemi.Marin@cdph.ca.gov>
Subject: Re: San Francisco Expenditures

Good Afternoon Michael,

Apologies for the oversight of the form, please find both R3 and R4 attached and let us know if you have any follow up questions. FYI, we have an internal fiscal deadline of 7/11 related to FY24/25 personnel cost accounting, so approval by 7/11 would be greatly appreciated! Please let me know what I can do to support this.

Best,
Elijah

From: Fortunka, Michael@CDPH <Michael.Fortunka@cdph.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 11:03 AM
To: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>; Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH IZB Admin <izb.admin@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Kwong, Amanda (DPH) <amanda.kwong@sfdph.org>; Marin, Noemi@CDPH <Noemi.Marin@cdph.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: San Francisco Expenditures

Hi Elijah,

I saw the attached "FYC4A6" file in the IZB Admin e-mail box from your 6/23 request, but I do not see a budget modification form either in e-mail or IZ's folders. Please fill out the attached form explaining the changes requested, one each for the R3 and R4 modifications, and return to us so that Rodolfo and Noemi can approve.

Thank you.

Michael Fortunka
Health Program Specialist I
California Department of Public Health
Immunization Branch
850 Marina Bay Parkway, Building P, 2nd Floor
Richmond, CA 94804
510-412-1571

Confidential - Low

From: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 11:55 AM
To: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH IZB Admin <izb.admin@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Kwong, Amanda (SAN FRANCISCO) <Amanda.Kwong@sfdph.org>
Subject: Re: San Francisco Expenditures

Hi Rodolfo,

We would like to follow up on this budget revision request. Has it been approved yet? Our accounting team needs to wrap up payroll processing by this Friday.

Thank you,
Elijah

From: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2025 1:12 PM
To: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>; CDPH IZB Admin <izb.admin@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Kwong, Amanda (DPH) <amanda.kwong@sfdph.org>
Subject: RE: San Francisco Expenditures

Received.

Thanks

Confidential - Low

From: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2025 12:05 PM
To: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH IZB Admin <izb.admin@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Kwong, Amanda (SAN FRANCISCO) <Amanda.Kwong@sfdph.org>

Subject: Re: San Francisco Expenditures

Hi Rodolfo and CDPH,

SFDPH would like to submit a budget revision for IZ COVID Supplement R3 and R4. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Elijah

From: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 11:33 AM
To: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>; Kwong, Amanda (DPH) <amanda.kwong@sfdph.org>
Subject: RE: San Francisco Expenditures

Hi Elijah,

That is fine.

Thanks

Confidential - Low

From: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 11:27 AM
To: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>; Kwong, Amanda (SAN FRANCISCO) <Amanda.Kwong@sfdph.org>
Subject: Re: San Francisco Expenditures

Hi Rodolfo,

is it possible to submit a budget revision for Covid supplemental funding? We need to adjust the allocation to sub contractor.

Thank you,
Elijah

From: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 8:57:23 AM
To: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>
Subject: Re: San Francisco Expenditures

Good morning Rodolfo,

Thanks you for this additional guidance, it was very timely for us with closing our the fiscal year. Are you able to share what the updated guidance is based off of?

Thank you,
Elijah

From: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 9, 2025 3:25 PM
To: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>; Kwong, Amanda (DPH) <amanda.kwong@sfdph.org>; Quinonez, Miguel (DPH) <miguel.quinonez@sfdph.org>
Subject: RE: San Francisco Expenditures

Hi Elijah,

Here's the guideline for now:

The current IZB NOA specifies an award end date of June 30, 2025 for COVID supplemental funds . LHJs may continue to submit invoices for allowable COVID expenses through June 30, 2025.

CDPH's Immunization Branch anticipates receiving a new NOA shortly for core funding for the period beginning July, and will provide further written instruction, specific to each grantee and contractor, on the process for revising current agreements to reflect the absence of COVID supplemental funds beyond June 30, 2025.

Thanks

Confidential - Low

From: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>
Sent: Monday, June 9, 2025 1:17 PM
To: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>; Kwong, Amanda (SAN FRANCISCO) <Amanda.Kwong@sfdph.org>; Quinonez, Miguel (DPH) <miguel.quinonez@sfdph.org>

Subject: Re: San Francisco Expenditures

Received, will stand by, thank you.

From: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 9, 2025 12:02 PM
To: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>; Kwong, Amanda (DPH) <amanda.kwong@sfdph.org>; Quinonez, Miguel (DPH) <miguel.quinonez@sfdph.org>
Subject: RE: San Francisco Expenditures

Hi Elijah,

Please hold off on COVID funds for now. We might be receiving new guidance much sooner than expected.

Thanks

Confidential - Low

From: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH
Sent: Monday, June 9, 2025 9:24 AM
To: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>; Kwong, Amanda (SAN FRANCISCO) <Amanda.Kwong@sfdph.org>; Quinonez, Miguel (DPH) <miguel.quinonez@sfdph.org>
Subject: RE: San Francisco Expenditures

Hi Elijah,

The current guideline is that it's allowable to bill for COVID expenditures. However, we may receive a different guideline by end of the month.

Thanks

From: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>
Sent: Friday, June 6, 2025 10:18 AM
To: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>; Kwong, Amanda (SAN FRANCISCO) <Amanda.Kwong@sfdph.org>; Quinonez, Miguel (DPH) <miguel.quinonez@sfdph.org>
Subject: Re: San Francisco Expenditures

Hi Rodolfo,

If it is allowable, we plan to charge staff time to COVID supplemental awards and we anticipate this spending our remaining funds.

Thank you,
Elijah

From: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>
Sent: Friday, June 6, 2025 8:43 AM
To: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>; Kwong, Amanda (DPH) <amanda.kwong@sfdph.org>; Quinonez, Miguel (DPH) <miguel.quinonez@sfdph.org>
Subject: RE: San Francisco Expenditures

Hi Elijah,

I would just like to ask if you anticipate spending all of your remaining funds.

Thanks

Confidential - Low

From: Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2025 11:01 AM
To: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>; Kwong, Amanda (SAN FRANCISCO) <Amanda.Kwong@sfdph.org>; Quinonez, Miguel (DPH) <miguel.quinonez@sfdph.org>
Subject: Re: San Francisco Expenditures

Hi Rodolfo,

The only discrepancy we see is the award amount for COVID Round 1 which should be $175,105.

Thank you,

Elijah

From: Ruiz, Rodolfo@CDPH <Rodolfo.Ruiz@cdph.ca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2025 4:41 PM
To: Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>; Saunders, Elijah (DPH) <elijah.saunders@sfdph.org>; Kwong, Amanda (DPH) <amanda.kwong@sfdph.org>; Quinonez, Miguel (DPH) <miguel.quinonez@sfdph.org>
Subject: San Francisco Expenditures

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

Immunization Coordinators and Fiscal Staff:

As we near the end of the current fiscal year it is important for the Immunization Branch to have accurate expenditure totals by fund source. Early verification of remaining award balances will facilitate accurate and timely encumbrances for FY2025-26. At this time, we do not have additional information to share regarding COVID-19 funding.

We request your assistance in verifying the accuracy of CDPH expenditure data for your county immunization program. Please reply and confirm that you agree with the total expenditure and remaining balance information detailed in the two sections below. If there are discrepancies, please set-up a meeting to review and discuss your findings.

Co, of San Francisco **Agreement Number: 22-11052** **Last FY2024-25 Invoice Received by CDPH: Q4**

FY2024-25 EXPENDITURE DATA

LHD	Funding Source	FY2024-25 Award Amount	FY2024-25 Expenditures	FY2024-25 Award Balance	Percentage Expended
San Francisco	IMM/VPD Annual Grant	275,070.00	143,083.81	131,986.19	52%
San Francisco	COVID-19 Round 2	20,524.16	8,644.24	11,879.92	0%
San Francisco	COVID-19 Round 3	1,588,259.06	739,739.21	848,519.85	47%
San Francisco	COVID-19 Round 4	1,482,177.08	765,044.65	717,132.43	52%

YEAR-TO-DATE COVID-19 EXPENDITURE DATA

County	Funding Source	Award Amount	FY2020-21 Expenditures	FY2021-2022 Expenditures	FY2022-23 Expenditures	FY2023-24 Expenditures	FY2024-25 Expenditures	Year-To-Date Expenditures	Total Award Balance	Percentage Expended
SAN FRANCISCO	COVID-19 Round 1	166,456.76	166,456.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	166,456.76	0.00	100%
SAN FRANCISCO	COVID-19 Round 2	175,105.00	0.00	149,684.89	0.00	4,895.95	8,644.24	163,225.08	11,879.92	93%
SAN FRANCISCO	COVID-19 Round 3	3,153,754.00	0.00	246,476.39	892,086.25	426,932.30	739,739.21	2,305,234.15	848,519.85	73%
SAN FRANCISCO	COVID-19 Round 4	3,153,754.00	0.00	181,750.90	599,384.49	890,441.53	765,044.65	2,436,621.57	717,132.43	77%

Reminders

- Quarter 3 invoice – with service period from 01/01/2025 – 03/31/2025 (VPD ONLY) was due May 15, 2025.
- Quarter 3 invoice – with service period from 01/01/2025 – 03/24/2025 (COVID ONLY or COVID & VPD) was due 04/09/2025.
- Quarter 3 supplemental invoice – with service period from 03/25/2025 – 3/31/2025 (VPD ONLY or COVID & VPD) was due 04/24/2025.
- Quarter 3 supplemental invoice – with service period from 03/25/2025 – 4/17/2025 (COVID ONLY or COVID & VPD) was due 04/24/2025.

- Quarter 4 invoice – with service period from 04/01/2025 – 04/17/2025 (COVID ONLY or COVID &VPD) was due 04/24/2025.
- Quarter 4 supplemental invoice – with service period from 04/18/2025 – 06/30/2025 (VDP ONLY) due August 29, 2025 (final FY invoice submission within 60-days from June 30th).
- Quarter 4 invoice – with service period from 04/01/2025 – 06/30/2025 (VPD ONLY) due August 29, 2025 (final FY invoice submission within 60-days from June 30th).

Thank you for your assistance.

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:	25.07.30 State Legislation Committee
Date:	Wednesday, July 30, 2025 2:29:30 PM
Attachments:	25.07.30 State Legislation Committee.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached approved positions before the California State Legislature from the State Legislation Committee meeting of July 30, 2025.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
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.*

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: Eileen Mariano, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
RE: State Legislation Committee Bill Positions (July 30, 2025 Meeting)
DATE: Wednesday, July 30, 2025

Dear Madam Clerk:

Please be advised that the State Legislation Committee approved the following positions on legislation pending before the California State Legislature:

AB/SB	Bill #	Author(s)	Title	Adopted Position
SB	283	Laird	Energy Storage Systems	Support
SB	63	Wiener	San Francisco Bay Area Local revenue measure: transportation funding	Support
SB	694	Archuleta	Deceptive Practices: Service Members and Veterans	Support

Present at the meeting were representatives from the Mayor's Office, Board President Rafael Mandelman's Office, Supervisor Connie Chan's Office, the City Attorney's Office, the Assessor's Office, the Controller's Office, and the Treasurer's Office. In addition, please find attached the approved minutes from the June 25, 2025 meeting.

Should the Board of Supervisors wish to find more information on these matters, they may do so at the following link: http://sfgov.org/slc/.

Sincerely,

Eileen Mariano
Manager of State and Federal Affairs

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 JUL 30 PM01:04

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

STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 30, 2025
10:00am – 12:00pm
City Hall, Room 201

OVERVIEW

This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above. Members of the public may view the meeting by reviewing the details below, with the video link, phone number, and other related information provided:

- **Meeting ID:** 2661 634 0008
- **Meeting Password:** qWpMyZCJ665
- **Join by Phone at:** +1-415-655-0001 (Please dial "#" after entering the Meeting ID to view the meeting)
- **Link:** https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=md7b3563abbfba150644b03d46f7924bf
- **Public Comment:** Please review instructions on page 5.

MEMBERS

Mayor's Office (Chair) -- Eileen Mariano
Supervisor Connie Chan's Office -- Frances Hsieh
Board President Rafael Mandelman's Office – Brad Phelps
Assessor's Office -- Holly Lung
City Attorney's Office -- Rebekah Krell
Controller's Office -- Marie Warchol
Treasurer's Office – Amanda Fried

AGENDA

Meeting commenced at 10:01am.

I. **ROLL CALL**

Present: Eileen Mariano, Robyn Burke, Brad Phelps, Rebekah Krell, Holly Lung, Calvin Quock, and Amanda Fried.

II. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item).** Discussion and possible

action to approve the minutes from the meeting on June 25, 2025.

Motion to Approve: Robyn Burke
Seconded by: Brad Phelps
Approved: 7-0

III. **STATE LOBBYIST OVERVIEW AND UPDATE (Discussion Item).** The City's state lobbyist will present to the Committee an update on State legislative matters.

IV. **PROPOSED LEGISLATION (Discussion and Action).** Discussion and possible action item: the Committee will review and discuss state legislation affecting the City and County of San Francisco. Items are listed by Department, then by bill number.

New Business

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Presenter: Scott Ammon

SB 283 (Laird): Energy Storage Systems.
Recommended Position: Support

The bill would conform the California Building Code (CBC) and safety certification requirements to the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 855 standards for battery storage. Specifically, the bill would require projects submitted for certification to the California Energy Commission (CEC) to demonstrate that they are constructed consistent with the CBC or NFPA 855, whichever is most protective. SB 283 would require projects submitted to local authorities to be designed in accordance with NFPA 855. The bill would also require projects submitted to the CEC or local authorities to be inspected by local fire officials prior to commencing operations.

The SFPUC recommends a support position for SB 283.

Motion to Approve: Brad Phelps
Seconded by: Amanda Fried
Approved: 7-0

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
Presenter: Monique Webster

SB 63 (Wiener): San Francisco Bay Area Local revenue measure: transportation funding
Recommended Position: Support

SB 63 would establish a Transportation Revenue Measure District including Alameda, Contra Costa and San Francisco counties, with a provision for San Mateo and Santa Clara counties to opt in, to be administered by the Metropolitan

Transportation Commission (MTC). The bill would authorize a multi-county regional transportation funding measure in the form of a sales tax, for a duration of 10 to 15 years subject to voter approval on the November 2026 ballot, to fund transit operations in the Bay Area.

Motion to Approve: Amanda Fried
Seconded by: Brad Phelps
Approved: 7-0

San Francisco Human Services Agency
Presenter: Rose Johns

SB 694 (Archuleta): Deceptive Practices: Service Members and Veterans
Recommended Position: Support

Senate Bill 694 seeks to strengthen protections for veterans by prohibiting any person not accredited by the Veterans Administration (VA) from charging a veteran for help with a benefits claim, prohibiting the charging of fees that exceed what a VA-accredited attorney or claims agent could legally charge to assist a veteran with a benefits claim, and prohibiting the requiring of access to veterans' data on VA systems.

As the home of the accredited San Francisco County Veterans Service Office, the Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS) supports this bill to help ensure veterans utilize trusted and accountable claims assistance.

Motion to Approve: Robyn Burke
Seconded by: Holly Lung
Approved: 7-0

V. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT. Members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the Committee's subject matter jurisdiction and that do not appear on the agenda.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 10:24am.

Disability Access

Room 201 of City Hall is located at 1 Dr. Carton B. Goodlett Place and is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible Muni lines serving this location are: #47 Van Ness, and the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness, as well as Muni Metro stations at Van Ness and Civic Center. For more information about Muni accessible services, call 923-6142. There is accessible parking at the Civic Center Plaza garage.

The State Legislation Committee does not permit remote public comment by members of the public its meetings, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings. If you require remote access as a means of reasonable accommodation under ADA, please contact the State Legislation Committee to request remote access, including a description of the functional limitation(s) that precludes your ability to attend in person. Requests made at least two business days in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability. For further assistance, please contact Joshua Cardenas, Mayor's Office, at: joshua.cardenas@sfgov.org.

Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance

The government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions 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 Donna Hall at Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, by phone at 415-554-7724, by fax at 415-554-7854, or email the Sunshine Ordinance Taskforce Administrator at sotf@sfgov.org. Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by contacting the Task Force, or by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at www.sfgov.org/sunshine.htm.

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 Sec. 2.100 –2.160) 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 415-581-2300, fax 415-581-2317, Internet website: www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Cell Phones and Pagers

The ringing 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 a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

Public Comment

Public Comment will be taken in-person on each item on the agenda before or during consideration of that item.

- To view the meeting via computer systems:
  https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m6681835cd6480991d3922332297f1336
  NOTE: Depending on your broadband/WIFI connection, there may be a 30-second to 2-minute delay when viewing the meeting live.

- To view the meeting via phone:
  - **Join by Phone at**: +1-415-655-0001
  - **Webinar ID:** 2669 222 6780
  - **NOTE:** Once you join the meeting via the number above, enter the webinar ID and then press **#** to enter the meeting.

Information Regarding Providing Public Comment

Each individual may comment 1 time per agenda item.
Each individual may speak for up to 2 minutes; after which time the line is automatically silenced.

Documents that may have been provided to members of the State Legislation Committee in connection with the items on the agenda include proposed state legislation, consultant reports, correspondence and reports from City departments, and public correspondence. These may be inspected by contacting Eileen Mariano, Manager, State and Federal Affairs, Mayor's Office at: eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org.

Health Considerations

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

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: State Leg Committee Agenda
Date:	Wednesday, July 30, 2025 8:30:00 AM
Attachments:	000 - 07.30.25 Agenda Packet.docx

Hello,

Please see below and attached for the July 30, 2025, State Legislation Committee meeting agenda.

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: Zhang, Adrianna (MYR - Contractor) <adrianna.zhang@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 9:24 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mariano, Eileen (MYR) <eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org>
Subject: State Leg Committee Agenda

Hi,

Attached is the Agenda Packet for the State Legislation Committee on Wednesday 7/30/25. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best,
Adrianna

STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 30, 2025
10:00am – 12:00pm
City Hall, Room 201

OVERVIEW

This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above. Members of the public may view the meeting by reviewing the details below, with the video link, phone number, and other related information provided:

- **Meeting ID:** 2661 634 0008
- **Meeting Password:** qWpMyZCJ665
- **Join by Phone at:** +1-415-655-0001 (Please dial "#" after entering the Meeting ID to view the meeting)
- **Link:** https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=md7b3563abbfba150644b03d46f7924bf
- **Public Comment:** Please review instructions on page 3.

MEMBERS

Mayor's Office (Chair) -- Eileen Mariano
Supervisor Connie Chan's Office -- Robyn Burke
Board President Rafael Mandelman's Office – Brad Phelps
Assessor's Office -- Holly Lung
City Attorney's Office -- Rebekah Krell
Controller's Office -- Greyson Spencer
Treasurer's Office – Amanda Fried

AGENDA

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item). Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting on June 25, 2025.

III. STATE LOBBYIST OVERVIEW AND UPDATE (Discussion Item). The City's state lobbyist will present to the Committee an update on State legislative matters.

IV. PROPOSED LEGISLATION (Discussion and Action). Discussion and possible action item: the Committee will review and discuss state legislation affecting the City and County of San Francisco. Items are listed by Department, then by bill number.

New Business

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Presenter: Scott Ammon

SB 283 (Laird): Energy Storage Systems.
Recommended Position: Support

The bill would conform the California Building Code (CBC) and safety certification requirements to the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 855 standards for battery storage. Specifically, the bill would require projects submitted for certification to the California Energy Commission (CEC) to demonstrate that they are constructed consistent with the CBC or NFPA 855, whichever is most protective. SB 283 would require projects submitted to local authorities to be designed in accordance with NFPA 855. The bill would also require projects submitted to the CEC or local authorities to be inspected by local fire officials prior to commencing operations.

The SFPUC recommends a support position for SB 283.

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
Presenter: Monique Webster

SB 63 (Wiener): San Francisco Bay Area Local revenue measure: transportation funding
Recommended Position: Support

SB 63 would establish a Transportation Revenue Measure District including Alameda, Contra Costa and San Francisco counties, with a provision for San Mateo and Santa Clara counties to opt in, to be administered by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The bill would authorize a multi-county regional transportation funding measure in the form of a sales tax, for a duration of 10 to 15 years subject to voter approval on the November 2026 ballot, to fund transit operations in the Bay Area.

V. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT. Members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the Committee's subject matter jurisdiction and that do not appear on the agenda.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Disability Access

Room 201 of City Hall is located at 1 Dr. Carton B. Goodlett Place and is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible Muni lines serving this location are: #47 Van Ness, and the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness, as well as Muni Metro stations at Van Ness and Civic Center. For more information about Muni accessible services, call 923-6142. There is accessible parking at the Civic Center Plaza garage.

The State Legislation Committee does not permit remote public comment by members of the public its meetings, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings. If you require remote access as a means of reasonable accommodation under ADA, please contact the State Legislation Committee to request remote access, including a description of the functional limitation(s) that precludes your ability to attend in person. Requests made at least two business days in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability. For further assistance, please contact Joshua Cardenas, Mayor's Office, at: joshua.cardenas@sfgov.org.

Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance

The government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions 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 Donna Hall at Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, by phone at 415-554-7724, by fax at 415-554-7854, or email the Sunshine Ordinance Taskforce Administrator at sotf@sfgov.org. Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by contacting the Task Force, or by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at www.sfgov.org/sunshine.htm.

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 Sec. 2.100 –2.160) 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 415-581-2300, fax 415-581-2317, Internet website: www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Cell Phones and Pagers

The ringing 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 a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

Public Comment

Public Comment will be taken in-person on each item on the agenda before or during consideration of that item.

- To view the meeting via computer systems:
  https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m6681835cd6480991d3922332297f1336
  NOTE: Depending on your broadband/WIFI connection, there may be a 30-second to 2-minute delay when viewing the meeting live.

- To view the meeting via phone:
  - **Join by Phone at**: +1-415-655-0001
  - **Webinar ID:** 2669 222 6780
  - **NOTE:** Once you join the meeting via the number above, enter the webinar ID and then press # to enter the meeting.

Information Regarding Providing Public Comment

Each individual may comment 1 time per agenda item.
Each individual may speak for up to 2 minutes; after which time the line is automatically silenced.

Documents that may have been provided to members of the State Legislation Committee in connection with the items on the agenda include proposed state legislation, consultant reports, correspondence and reports from City departments, and public correspondence. These may be inspected by contacting Eileen Mariano, Manager, State and Federal Affairs, Mayor's Office at: eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org.

Health Considerations

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 25, 2025
10:00am – 12:00pm
City Hall, Room 201

OVERVIEW

This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above. Members of the public may view the meeting by reviewing the details below, with the video link, phone number, and other related information provided:

- **Meeting ID:** 2669 222 6780
- **Meeting Password:** Sv2pwKuHK24
- **Join by Phone at:** +1-415-655-0001 (Please dial "#" after entering the Meeting ID to view the meeting)
- **Link:** https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m6681835cd6480991d3922332297f1336
- **Public Comment:** Please review instructions on page 7.

MEMBERS

Mayor's Office (Chair) -- Eileen Mariano
Supervisor Connie Chan's Office – Robyn Burke
Board President Rafael Mandelman's Office – Calvin Ho
Assessor's Office -- Holly Lung
City Attorney's Office -- Rebekah Krell
Controller's Office -- Hannah Kohanzadeh
Treasurer's Office -- Eric Manke

AGENDA

Meeting commenced at 10:02am.

VII. ROLL CALL

Present: Eileen Mariano, Robyn Burke, Calvin Ho, Rebekah Krell, Hannah Kohanzadeh, and Eric Manke. Assessor's Office was not present.

VIII. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item). Discussion and possible

action to approve the minutes from the meeting on May 28, 2025.

Motion to Approve: Eric Manke
Seconded by: Hannah Kohanzadeh
Approved: 6-0

IX. STATE LOBBYIST OVERVIEW AND UPDATE (Discussion Item). The City's state lobbyist will present to the Committee an update on State legislative matters.

X. PROPOSED LEGISLATION (Discussion and Action). Discussion and possible action item: the Committee will review and discuss state legislation affecting the City and County of San Francisco. Items are listed by Department, then by bill number.

New Business

San Francisco Ethics Commission
Presenter: Michael Canning

AB 775 (Fong): Behested payments: reporting.
Recommended Position: Support

This bill would require the State's behested payment disclosure reports to be filed electronically with the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC), unless the appropriate local government agency is willing to accept the forms and post them online. The bill also modifies the deadlines for elected officials reporting behested payments.

Ethics Commission staff recommend the City support this legislation as it will improve the processes associated with the filing of a required State form and demonstrate a flexible model for the filing of State forms with local governments that may be beneficial for other filings in the future.

Motion to Approve: Robyn Burke
Seconded by: Holly Lung
Approved: 7-0

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Presenter: Kellie McManamon

SB 72 (Caballero): California Water Plan: long-term supply targets.
Recommended Position: Support

SB 72 revises the California Water Plan to expand upon and plan for long-term water supply targets to overcome a drought. Future plans must include various scenarios for water supply targets with a 50-year planning horizon. For the 2028 plan, the bill solidifies a planning target of 9,000,000 acre-feet of additional water or

storage capacity.

The bill also requires the Department of Water Resources (Department) to identify California's water needs across regions and impacts associated with proposed projects. In order to evaluate best practices for preservation of natural resources and stewardship of the land, the Department will confer with an advisory committee. The committee will be comprised of a wide range of stakeholders including representation from unions, tribes, local governments, water agencies, and expert researchers on the environment, water, and climate science.

The SFPUC recommends a support position for SB 72.

Motion to Approve: Calvin Ho
Seconded by: Hannah Kohanzadeh
Approved: 7-0

San Francisco Adult Probation Department
Presenter: Alek Hartwick

AB 247 (Bryan): Incarcerated individual hand crew members: wages
Recommended Position: Support

AB 247 requires incarcerated hand crew members and a ward or youth placed at the Pine Grove Youth Conservation Camp to be paid an hourly wage of $7.25 and to have the wage rate updated on an annual basis.

Motion to Approve: Eric Manke
Seconded by: Hannah Kohanzadeh
Approved: 7-0

San Francisco Adult Probation Department
Presenter: Alek Hartwick

AB 248 (Bryan): Uncapped Earnings for Incarcerated Workers Act
Recommended Position: Support

Authorizes the County Board of Supervisors to determine a wage to be credited to each prisoner if the prisoner is confined in or committed to a county jail and performs a work assignment.

Motion to Approve: Eric Manke
Seconded by: Calvin Ho
Approved: 7-0

San Francisco Adult Probation Department
Presenter: Alek Hartwick

AB 1140 (Connolly): Single-Occupancy Cell Pilot Program.
Recommended Position: Support

AB 1140 will implement a pilot program in four adult facilities, requiring that 10% or more of the incarcerated population in those facilities be housed in single-occupancy cells.

Motion to Approve: Eric Manke
Seconded by: Hannah Kohanzadeh
Approved: 7-0

San Francisco Department of Early Childhood
Presenter: Arianna Cruz-Sellu

AB 753 (Garcia): Childcare: facility licensure: teacher requirements.
Recommended Position: Support

California continues to experience ongoing early childhood educator staffing shortages. These shortages impact families in accessing care and the stability it provides. Providers struggle to keep classrooms fully staffed. AB 753 addresses staffing shortages while providing a workforce pathway which eliminates barriers for early in their career as educators.

Motion to Approve: Robyn Burke
Seconded by: Hannah Kohanzadeh
Approved: 7-0

San Francisco Environment Department
Presenter: Joseph Piesecki and Alice Hur

SB 615 (Allen): Vehicle traction batteries.
Recommended Position: Support

SB 615 would create a framework to ensure all electric vehicle (EV) batteries are eventually recycled at their end of life and encourages sustainable practices of repair and repurposing. San Francisco is committed to achieving net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040, as outlined in our Climate Action Plan, which prioritizes electrifying transportation and building a regenerative circular economy that minimizes waste production. As more residents and fleets transition to EVs, we must ensure that the growing volume of EV batteries is handled in a way that protects public health, conserves resources, and reduces environmental harm. Research published by the Department of Energy shows the potential of recycled EV batteries, which could continue to be used for energy storage applications and work for 10 years or more after end of life, barring failure or damages.

Motion to Approve: Calvin Ho
Seconded by: Hannah Kohanzadeh
Approved: 7-0

XI. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT. Members of the public may address the

Committee on items of interest that are within the Committee's subject matter jurisdiction and that do not appear on the agenda.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 10:43am.

Disability Access

Room 201 of City Hall is located at 1 Dr. Carton B. Goodlett Place and is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible Muni lines serving this location are: #47 Van Ness, and the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness, as well as Muni Metro stations at Van Ness and Civic Center. For more information about Muni accessible services, call 923-6142. There is accessible parking at the Civic Center Plaza garage.

The State Legislation Committee does not permit remote public comment by members of the public its meetings, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings. If you require remote access as a means of reasonable accommodation under ADA, please contact the State Legislation Committee to request remote access, including a description of the functional limitation(s) that precludes your ability to attend in person. Requests made at least two business days in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability. For further assistance, please contact Joshua Cardenas, Mayor's Office, at: joshua.cardenas@sfgov.org.

Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance

The government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions 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 Donna Hall at Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, by phone at 415-554-7724, by fax at 415-554-7854, or email the Sunshine Ordinance Taskforce Administrator at sotf@sfgov.org. Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by contacting the Task Force, or by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at www.sfgov.org/sunshine.htm.

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 Sec. 2.100 –2.160) 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 415-581-2300, fax 415-581-2317, Internet website: www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Cell Phones and Pagers

The ringing 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 a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

Public Comment

Public Comment will be taken in-person on each item on the agenda before or during consideration of that item.

- To view the meeting via computer systems:
  https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m6681835cd6480991d3922332297f1336
  NOTE: Depending on your broadband/WIFI connection, there may be a 30-second to 2-minute delay when viewing the meeting live.

- To view the meeting via phone:
  - **Join by Phone at**: +1-415-655-0001
  - **Webinar ID:** 2669 222 6780
  - **NOTE:** Once you join the meeting via the number above, enter the webinar ID and then press # to enter the meeting.

Information Regarding Providing Public Comment

Each individual may comment 1 time per agenda item.
Each individual may speak for up to 2 minutes; after which time the line is automatically silenced.

Documents that may have been provided to members of the State Legislation Committee in connection with the items on the agenda include proposed state legislation, consultant reports, correspondence and reports from City departments, and public correspondence. These may be inspected by contacting Eileen Mariano, Manager, State and Federal Affairs, Mayor's Office at: eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org.

Health Considerations

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org, Aly Bonde at aly.bonde@sfgov.org, and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	7/14/2025
Submitting Department	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Contact Name	Scott Ammon
Contact Email and Phone Number	sammon@sfwater.org; 415-407-5208
SLC Meeting Presenter	Scott Ammon
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	X YES ☐ NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	☐ YES ☐ NO X N/A

SB 283
Senator John Laird, Senate District #17, D-Santa Cruz
Energy storage systems

Position

☐ **SPONSOR** X **SUPPORT** ☐ **SUPPORT if amended** ☐ **OPPOSE** ☐ **OTHER & Describe**

Summary

The bill would conform the California Building Code (CBC) and safety certification requirements to the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 855 standards for battery storage. Specifically, the bill would require projects submitted for certification to the California Energy Commission (CEC) to demonstrate that they are constructed consistent with the CBC or NFPA 855, whichever is most protective. SB 283 would require projects submitted to local authorities to be designed in accordance with NFPA 855. The bill would also require projects submitted to the CEC or local authorities to be inspected by local fire officials prior to commencing operations.

The SFPUC recommends a support position for SB 283.

Background/Analysis

In 2022, the Legislature passed and the Governor signed AB 205 which allows BESS projects capable of storing 200 MWh or more to participate in the CEC's Opt-In Certification Program. The program provides an alternative to local jurisdiction permitting to help streamline approval of eligible projects. The Governor and Legislature expanded program eligibility to BESS projects to help accelerate California's transition to renewable energy while maintaining electric system reliability. According to the State's SB 100 Joint Agency Report,[1] California will need to triple existing battery storage capacity to 52,000 MW by 2045 to successfully meet growing energy demand and the State's 2045 carbon neutrality target.

The State is currently implementing legislation to ensure the safety of BESS projects. On March 13, 2025, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) approved a resolution to implement requirements pursuant to SB 1383 (2022) and SB 38 (2023) to improve the safety and reliability of energy storage facilities.

Challenge

The bill builds on existing state law to help ensure the safety of new BESS projects. As California transitions towards a clean energy economy, BESS projects are increasingly critical to ensuring the state can meet its clean energy goals. BESS

[1] 2021 SB 100 Joint Agency Report, Achieving 100 Percent Clean Electricity in California: An Initial Assessment. https://www.energy.ca.gov/publications/2021/2021-sb-100-joint-agency-report-achieving-100-percent-clean-electricity

projects are integral to ensuring system reliability by storing excess power generated from renewables and providing this power during periods of high demand and when renewables such as solar and wind are not generating. Therefore, ensuring the safety of these projects is paramount as California increases the development of new systems. SB 283 improves BESS safety by conforming state requirements to national safety standards.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The SFPUC recommends a support position for SB 283.

Departments Impacted & Why

As a clean energy provider and proponent of BESS projects statewide, the SFPUC understands the importance of ensuring the safety of new BESS projects. SB 283 improves the safety of new BESS facilities without impeding the development of energy storage resources which CleanPowerSF will increasingly rely on to provide our ratepayers with clean power and to support California's clean energy transition.

Fiscal Impact

There are no anticipated fiscal impacts to the SFPUC or other City departments.

Support / Opposition

Support
California Professional Firefighters
California State Association of Counties (CSAC)
California State Association of Electrical Workers
Coalition of California Utility Employees
County of Monterey
County of Santa Cruz
Democrats of Rossmoor
League of California Cities
Monterey; County of
Orange County Fire Authority
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC)
San Diego Gas and Electric Company
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors
Southern California Edison
Tri County Chamber Alliance

Support If Amended
California Community Choice Association
Fluence Energy, INC.

Oppose
None on file

State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two
pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org, Aly Bonde at aly.bonde@sfgov.org, and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	7/18/2025
Submitting Department	Municipal Transportation Agency
Contact Name	Monique Webster
Contact Email and Phone Number	Monique.webster@sfmta.com
SLC Meeting Presenter	Monique Webster
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	X YES ☐ NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	☐ YES ☐ NO X N/A

SB 63
Senator Scott Wiener, Senate District #11, D-San Francisco
San Francisco Bay area: local revenue measure: transportation funding.

Recommended Position

☐ SPONSOR X SUPPORT ☐ SUPPORT if amended ☐ OPPOSE ☐ OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 63 would establish a Transportation Revenue Measure District including Alameda, Contra Costa and San Francisco counties, with a provision for San Mateo and Santa Clara counties to opt in, to be administered by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The bill would authorize a multi-county regional transportation funding measure in the form of a sales tax, for a duration of 10 to 15 years subject to voter approval on the November 2026 ballot, to fund transit operations in the Bay Area.

Background/Analysis

Public transportation is an essential service. Every day, transit systems like Muni, BART, Caltrain, and AC Transit help Bay Area residents and visitors travel throughout the region. The erosion of fare revenues due to shifting post-pandemic travel patterns and the reduction in other funding sources have made this funding model untenable, despite cost-saving measures that transit agencies have taken to be more financially efficient and improve service.

Federal Covid relief funds and one-time state funding have helped to bridge the gap and avert large-scale cuts to transit service; however, these funds will be expended in the current fiscal year, and the “fiscal cliff” will be upon the region starting next fiscal year. Without new funding, Bay Area transit systems will be forced to make devastating service cuts that would push public transit into a death spiral. The loss of transit service would disproportionately impact lower income people of color, greatly increase traffic congestion and pollution, and undermine San Francisco’s and the region's economic recovery.

Challenge

BART and Caltrain were highly fare-reliant pre-pandemic. Each had farebox recovery ratios in the 70 percent range – meaning they covered 70% of their expenses with fare revenue. Muni was highly reliant on General Fund, parking, and fare revenues. Due to remote work trends and inflation-induced operating cost increases, revenues for all these transit systems have drastically reduced and have been slow to recover.

While agencies are working hard to increase ridership, the revenue recovery has been insufficient and additional subsidy is needed in order to maintain service. Beginning in July 2026, the SFMTA faces a projected $322 million deficit when

temporary state and federal pandemic relief funding expires. The combined operating deficits of SFMTA, BART, Caltrain, and AC Transit are projected to amount to over $800 million. For the SFMTA, revenue from key sources—taxes, parking, and fares—remains below pre-pandemic levels due to shifting commute patterns and the slow recovery of downtown San Francisco. Meanwhile, operating costs continue to rise, driven by inflation and necessary wage adjustments.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

In September 2024 the Controller's office convened the Muni Funding Working Group (MFWG) to identify strategies to address SFMTA's budget deficit. On July 15, 2025, the Controller's Office released the final report of the MFWG, which indicated broad support both a regional ballot measure and a local ballot measure to generate new revenues, along with other strategies.

SB 63 would establish a Transportation Revenue Measure District including Alameda, Contra Costa and San Francisco counties, with a provision for San Mateo and Santa Clara counties to opt in, to be administered by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The bill would authorize a multi-county regional transportation funding measure in the form of a sales tax, for a duration of 10 to 15 years subject to voter approval on the November 2026 ballot, to fund transit operations in the Bay Area.

Departments Impacted & Why

SFMTA

Fiscal Impact

SB 63 would authorize a sales tax rate of 0.5 percent in all participating counties except San Francisco, in which the rate may range from 0.5 to 1.0 percent, subject to voter approval. In San Francisco County, a sales tax of 1.0 percent would generate around
$235 million per year.

Support / Opposition

Support

Bay Area Council City of Alameda City of El Cerrito City of Pinole
Climate Action California
Metropolitan Transportation Commission Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District
San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority San Francisco County Transportation Authority
San Francisco Mayor Daniel Lurie SPUR

Opposition

California Association of REALTORS California Building Industry Association California Business Properties Association California Taxpayers Association Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

Item 5

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 Inquiry from Supervisor Fielder
Date:	Monday, July 28, 2025 3:41:00 PM
Attachments:	LOI Response - Supervisor Fielder - GW Signed 7.28.25.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Office of the Controller, submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Jackie Fielder at the July 15, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting.

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: Wagner, Greg (CON) <greg.wagner@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 3:04 PM
To: Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Han, Feng (BOS) <feng.han@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Stone, Claire (CON) <claire.stone@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Fielder

Dear Supervisor Fielder, the Controller's Office response to your letter of inquiry is attached.
Best,
Greg

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2025 8:49 AM
To: Yep, Paul (POL) <Paul.Yep@sfgov.org>; Miyamoto, Paul (SHF) <paul.miyamoto@sfgov.org>; Wagner, Greg (CON) <greg.wagner@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; De Asis, Edward (BOS) <edward.deasis@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>; david.chiu@sfcityatty.org; RUSSI, BRAD (CAT)

<Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org>; Ortiz, Lisa (POL) <lisa.ortiz@sfgov.org>; Gamero, Lili (POL) <lili.gamero@sfgov.org>; Malouf, Rima (POL) <rima.malouf@sfgov.org>; Lopez, Steven (POL) <steven.lopez1@sfgov.org>; Aroche, Diana (POL) <diana.aroche@sfgov.org>; Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Nicita, Carl (POL) <carl.nicita@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Katherine (SHF) <katherine.johnson@sfgov.org>; Moriarty, Tara (SHF) <tara.moriarty@sfgov.org>; Jue, Richard (SHF) <richard.jue@sfgov.org>; Chan, Sarah (SHF) <sarah.e.chan@sfgov.org>; christian.kropff@sfgov.org; Ma, ChiaYu (CON) <chiayu.ma@sfgov.org>; Hossain, Ayeesha (CON) <ayeesha.hossain@sfgov.org>; Stone, Claire (CON) <claire.stone@sfgov.org>; Egan, Ted (CON) <ted.egan@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Mariano, Eileen (MYR) <eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org>; Bonde, Aly (MYR) <aly.bonde@sfgov.org>; Han, Feng (BOS) <feng.han@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Fielder

Dear Interim Chief Yep, Sheriff Miyamoto, Controller Wagner, and Mayor Lurie,

Please see the attached memorandum, from the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, regarding a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Jackie Fielder at the July 15, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting.

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.*

OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Greg Wagner
Controller

ChiaYu Ma
Deputy Controller

July 28, 2025

Supervisor Jackie Fielder
Member, Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Supervisor Fielder:

This letter is written in response to your Letter of Inquiry issued July 14, 2025. In your letter, you requested that the Controller's Office respond to the following questions:

- How many regular hours has SFPD and SF Sheriff's dedicated to responding to first amendment activities from January 1, 225 to April 30, 2025? From May 1, 2025 to today, July 14, 2025? How many overtime hours? What is the estimate of how much this has or will cost the city?
- How many regular and overtime hours has SFPD and SF Sheriff's dedicated to responding to first amendment activities on the following dates, and how much has this or will cost the city?:
    - Downtown Anti-ICE protests where protestors were kettled by SFPD - June 8, 2025
    - Arrests after peaceful Anti-ICE protest that started in the mission - June 9, 2025
    - "No Kings" Protest - June 14, 2025

While the Controller's Office can access payroll and financial records for the Sheriff's Department (SHF) and Police Department (POL), we do not independently collect data on staffing specifically related to individual events such as those described in your letter. In order to respond to your request to the best of our ability, my office consulted with both SHF and POL to identify responsive data.

Responses from departments are summarized below. SHF data are for overtime recorded as "unanticipated events," so could theoretically include any unplanned, one-time events that happened to fall on these days (potentially including but not limited to the events described in your letter), but excludes overtime to backfill jail custodial or security posts. POL maintains data by event code and date for overtime and comp time, but not for regular time.

Question 1

How many regular hours has SFPD and SF Sheriff's dedicated to responding to first amendment activities from January 1, 225 to April 30, 2025? From May 1, 2025 to today, July 14, 2025? How many overtime hours? What is the estimate of how much this has or will cost the city?

SHF Payroll data are not structured in a way that allows identification of costs for "First amendment activities."

POL Time-keeping records for *regular hours* spent on First Amendment activities are not available. The average *overtime* cost is $127 per hour, and actual overtime hours based on the HRMS data for each period

Date	OT Hours	OT Cost
1/1-4/30/25	536	$ 68,009
5/1-6/30/25	2,332	$ 296,164
	2,868	**$ 364,173**

Question 2

How many regular and overtime hours has SFPD and SF Sheriff's dedicated to responding to first amendment activities on the following dates, and how much has this or will cost the city?:

○ Downtown Anti-ICE protests where protestors were kettled by SFPD - June 8, 2025

○ Arrests after peaceful Anti-ICE protest that started in the mission - June 9, 2025

○ "No Kings" Protest - June 14, 2025

SHF The following are recorded hours for "unanticipated events" on the dates requested"

Date	Regular	OT	Comp Time	Total Hours		OT	Comp Time	Total Cost
8-Jun	-	-	-	-		-	-	-
9-Jun	14	364	41	419		55,261	6,479	$ 61,740
14-Jun	56	362	15	433		56,237	2,983	$ 59,220
	70	**726**	**56**	**851**		**111,498**	**9,462**	**$ 120,960**

POL We do not have time-keeping records for *regular time* related to first amendment activities on these dates. The approximate cost in *overtime* is $229,807 based on the number of hours on the specific dates:

Date	OT Hours	OT Cost
8-Jun	575	$ 73,025
9-Jun	576	$ 73,184
14-Jun	658	$ 83,598
	1,810	**$ 229,807**

Sincerely,

Greg Wagner
Controller

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

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

July 16, 2025

Paul Yep, Interim Chief of Police
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
Via Email: Paul.Yep@sfgov.org

Daniel Lurie, Mayor
Office of the Mayor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via Email: Daniel.Lurie@sfgov.org

Paul Miyamoto, Sheriff
San Francisco Sheriff's Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 456
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via Email: Paul.Miyamoto@sfgov.org

Greg Wagner, Controller
Controller's Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 316
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via Email: Greg.Wagner@sfgov.org

Dear Interim Chief Yep, Sheriff Miyamoto, Controller Wagner, and Mayor Lurie,

At the July 15, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting, Supervisor Jackie Fielder issued the attached inquiry to the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), San Francisco Sheriff's Office (SHF), Office of the Mayor (MYR), and the Controller's Office (CON). Please review the attached letter of inquiry, which provides the Supervisor's request.

The inquiry, in summary, requests information on law enforcement protocol behind decisions to share license plate data with federal agencies, overtime cost estimates for SFPD and SHF response to protests, practices of surveilling protesters, protocols and practices for ensuring the safety of protesters when engaging with United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and protocols for verifying the identification of federal immigration officers to thwart impersonators.

Please contact Feng Han, Feng.Han@sfgov.org, Legislative Aide for Supervisor Fielder, 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 28, 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/JA/RL

Attachments:

- Letter of Inquiry
- Introduction Form

Cc: David Chiu, CAT, David.Chiu@sfcityatty.org
Brad Russi, CAT, Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org
Lisa Ortiz, SFPD, Lisa.Ortiz@sfgov.org
Lili Gamero, SFPD, Lili.Gamero@sfgov.org
Rima Malouf, SFPD, Rima.Malouf@sfgov.org
Steven Lopez, SFPD, Steven.Lopez@sfgov.org
Diana Oliva-Aroche, SFPD, Diana.Aroche@sfgov.org
Sgt. Stacy Youngblood, SFPD, Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org
Carl Nicita, SFPD, Carl.Nicita@sfgov.org
Katherine Johnson, SHF, Katherine.Johnson@sfgov.org
Tara Moriarty, SHF, Tara.Moriarty@sfgov.org
Rich Jue, SHF, Richard.Jue@sfgov.org
Sarah E. Chan, SHF, Sarah.E.Chan@sfgov.org
Christian Kropff, SHF, Cristian.Kropff@sfgov.org
ChiaYu Ma, CON, ChiaYu.ma@sfgov.org
Ayeesha Hossain, CON, Ayeesha.Hossain@sfgov.org
Claire Stone, CON, Claire.Stone@sfgov.org
Ted Egan, CON, Ted.Egan@sfgov.org
Adam Thongsavat, MYR, Adam.Thongsavat@sfgov.org
Eileen F. Mariano, MYR, Eileen.F.Mariano@sfgov.org
Aly Bonde, MYR, Aly.Bonde@sfgov.org

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 9

City and County of San Francisco

JACKIE FIELDER

LETTER OF INQUIRY

To:
Paul Yep, interim SFPD Chief
SF Sheriff Paul Miyamoto
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Controller Greg Wagner

CC:
City Attorney David Chiu
Deputy City Attorney Brad Russi
Madame Clerk Angela Calvillo

Dear Chief Yep, Sheriff Miyamoto, Controller Wagner, and Mayor Lurie,

I am submitting this Letter of Inquiry in light of extremely problematic statements from SFPD leadership concerning ICE and new reporting that SFPD officers have accessed Oakland's data at least 100 times on behalf of federal agencies, in violation of state law.

Last Tuesday, July 8, about 10 masked Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents tried to enter the courthouse at 100 Montgomery St to detain and deport an allegedly migrant person. In the process, ICE clashed with about 20 protestors blocking the doors with their bodies and bikes. ICE agents used pepper spray, shoved people to the ground, and, in one instance, brandished a rifle on protestors, as well as a reporter with *Mission Local*. A van carrying the detained person sped through half a dozen protesters crowded near its front and threw off a woman from the hood.

Meanwhile, contrary to SFPD's initial account that stated officers arrived *after* the van drove away, several SFPD officers were actually standing half a block away from the courthouse *while* 20 people clashed with ICE agents as depicted in *Mission Local*'s video. Two days later, in a Castro town hall, one of the highest ranking SFPD officials made several deeply troubling statements reported this weekend by *Mission Local*.

- "I think we're in this really difficult situation of, we don't want the community to get hurt. On the other side of the coin … we can't just sit by and watch our fellow law enforcement agent or officer get hurt."

- "Just like if CHP [the California Highway Patrol] were to get into some sort of a situation out on our streets off of some other traffic stop, for example, we would help them out of that situation,"

Here are some reasons why these quotes are alarming:

1. **ICE is armed, protestors are not. It's baffling that SFPD leadership would equate unarmed protestors with Trump's armed ICE agents.** ICE agents can protect themselves with their pepper spray, their guns, their vehicles, and their armor, as they did so readily last Tuesday. Protestors have not been reported to be armed.
2. **ICE doesn't need protection.** ICE agents have both the manpower and legal authority to arrest people as they have done in other cities. And with the passage of the reconciliation bill in Congress, Trump and the GOP have given an unprecedented amount of funds to ICE–around $45 billion for new detention centers and $30 billion for hiring more agents and expanding operations. And just over the weekend, Trump authorized ICE agents to protect themselves using "whatever means" necessary.
3. **SFPD should concern itself with the public safety of San Franciscans rather than ICE.** We have bigger fish to fry in the city of San Francisco than protecting ICE. 16th Street conditions deteriorated for several periods of time that coincided with the massive deployment of SFPD officers to protests. Officers are needed on proactive foot patrols in San Francisco neighborhoods, not defending ICE agents. If anything, SF law enforcement should be verifying the identity of federal agents at the scene of suspected immigration enforcement actions.
4. **Local laws do not treat ICE the same as CHP. ICE is a fascist agency doing Trump's bidding.** Our sanctuary laws explicitly treat ICE differently from non-immigration law enforcement such as CHP. Commander Lew's comparison of ICE and CHP is mistaken. Secondly, **ICE is not upholding the rule of law, it is helping Trump violate it.** It is disappearing people with no criminal history, without due process, here in San Francisco, and all over the country, and exporting them to El Salvador, South Sudan, and countries they have never lived in. This is not a law enforcement agency upholding public safety, it is a fascist operation that is violating court orders and the rule of law to stoke fear and sow chaos. Come to the Mission and you'll find the streets emptier because our immigrant family, friends and neighbors are scared for their lives to come outside and go to the grocery store. I have moms crying to me about how their young children are crying to them every time they see a police officer, thinking it's ICE. ICE is a force being operated by a tyrant to squash dissent, criminalize law-abiding residents, and instill fear. They are not legitimate, and should be seen as an extension of Trump himself.
5. **As elected officials, we took an oath of office to defend the constitution against all enemies foreign and domestic.** Unfortunately, we find ourselves in a country where the constitutional enemy is now in the Oval Office and using law enforcement agencies like ICE to do his bidding. And so, we find ourselves in unchartered waters. Legally we cannot interfere with federal immigration enforcement, which means we cannot have SFPD prevent ICE agents from entering buildings or arresting people. Yet, we are simultaneously failing in fulfilling our oath if we are silent on constitutional violations, or worse, potentially **violating our own sanctuary city laws by allowing SFPD to concern itself with defending ICE while they are disappearing people, without due process and sometimes even kidnapping the wrong people (see here, here, and here).**

Los Angeles Police Chief Jim McDonnell issued new guidance a few weeks ago directing officers to verify the identity of federal agents at the scene of suspected immigration enforcement actions. At the local level, we are the last line of defense against authoritarianism. SFPD and SF Sheriff's should consider the same directive.

I have all of these concerns, and more, related to how SFPD has been surveilling protestors, handing over ALPR data from Oakland to federal law enforcement agencies in violation of state laws, as well as dedicating hundreds—potentially thousands–of hours, of regular time and overtime to first amendment activities related to immigration and Trump. I also want to know how much these responses have cost our city. And so, I am submitting this Letter of Inquiry to the San Francisco Police Department, the SF Sheriff's Department, as well as the Controller.

To the Controller:

- How many regular hours has SFPD and SF Sheriff's dedicated to responding to first amendment activities from January 1, 225 to April 30, 2025? From May 1, 2025 to today, July 14, 2025? How many overtime hours? What is the estimate of how much this has or will cost the city?
- How many regular and overtime hours has SFPD and SF Sheriff's dedicated to responding to first amendment activities on the following dates, and how much has this or will cost the city?:
    - Downtown Anti-ICE protests where protestors were kettled by SFPD - June 8, 2025
    - Arrests after peaceful Anti-ICE protest that started in the mission - June 9, 2025
    - "No Kings" Protest - June 14, 2025

To SFPD and the SF Sheriff's Department:

Responding to ICE enforcement actions

- How does SFPD decide if it will deploy officers to an ICE enforcement operation?
- What are the operational protocols for SFPD responding to calls for service at suspected federal immigration enforcement actions? Does SFPD confirm enforcement actions with ICE?
- When SFPD or SF Sheriffs are present at a verified immigration enforcement action, what is their protocol for ensuring that ICE agents are honoring people's constitutional rights to due process?
- According to SFPD Department General Order 5.15, officers can provide assistance to ICE as an emergency response, and an emergency response is defined by DGO 5.05 as when it "appears reasonably necessary to prevent serious injury to persons, whether or not a criminal offense is involved." DGO 5.15 specifically prohibits, "assistance to ICE/CBP agents for routine ICE/CBP operations, investigations, or raids." Notably, SFPD did not intervene "to prevent serious injury to persons" on July 8, 2025 at 630 Sansome when a van sped through half a dozen protesters crowded near its front and threw off a woman from the hood, nearly running her over. Nor did it intervene when ICE agents brandished a rifle aimed at protestors and at least one *Mission Local* reporter.
    - What does SFPD consider "serious injury" if not these instances? As noted above, contrary to initial SFPD statements, officers were, indeed, on the scene half a block away from the courthouse where this occurred.
    - What training and protocols exist for officers to assess a situation for the potential of "serious injury?"

- Has SFPD arrested any ICE agents for violence against protestors or for reckless driving that could injure protestors? Why or why not?
- What are SFPD's protocols for responding to encounters between ICE and protestors, and enforcing basic safety and traffic laws, even when the violators are ICE agents?
- What protocols exist for SFPD and SF Sheriffs in identifying legitimate federal immigration enforcement officers, including obtaining clear identification and proper credentials of federal agents?
- On what grounds could SFPD or SF Sheriffs arrest federal immigration enforcement impersonators? What are the departments' protocols and training around this?
- What are SFPD's policies regarding 9-1-1 calls made reporting incidents of kidnapping in broad daylight or suspected federal immigration enforcement?

Accessing and sharing ALPR data on behalf of federal agencies

- The records obtained by the San Francisco Standard showed SFPD "accessing Oakland's ALPR data at least 100 times on behalf of federal agencies." Under California Senate Bill 34 (2015), police departments are prohibited from sharing ALPR data with out of state or federal agencies. Why did SFPD facilitate these data searches for the FBI, ATF, DEA, U.S. Marshals, U.S. Park Police, and U.S. Postal Inspection Service? Who initiated or signed off on these requests?
- Was SFPD aware at the time of these searches that sharing ALPR data with federal agencies is a violation of California state law?
- Has SFPD or SF Sheriffs ever provided ALPR data to ICE, or performed ALPR searches for immigration purposes, including at the request of ICE or any agency pursuing immigration-related cases?
- What internal policies do SFPD and the SF Sheriff's Department have to assess whether sharing ALPR data with other agencies complies with SB 34?
- Since Attorney General Bonta's 2023 notice regarding SB 34, has SFPD and SF Sheriff's Department conducted any audits, re-training, or taken disciplinary action related to ALPR data sharing?
- How does SFPD reconcile these practices with San Francisco's Sanctuary City ordinance? How will SFPD and SF Sheriff's Department ensure their practices both comply with state law and protect the privacy of local residents?

Using constrained law enforcement resources to respond to first amendment activities

- Regarding the following first amendment activities, how many people did SFPD or SF Sheriffs detain, arrest, process at a county jail, charge with a misdemeanor, charge with a felony, or release within 24 hours?
    - Downtown Anti-ICE protests where protestors were kettled by SFPD - June 8, 2025
    - Arrests after peaceful Anti-ICE protest that started in the mission - June 9, 2025
    - "No Kings" Protest - June 14, 2025
- Which kind of calls for service were made on these dates to Mission Police Station? What was SFPD or Sheriff response time to these calls?

- Regarding the following dates of SFPD and SF Sheriffs Department response to first amendment activities, were any drones deployed to monitor first amendment activities? Were any cameras, private or public, monitored in the vicinity? For what purpose? What kind of data or images were collected on protestors through drones or cameras? Does any of that data include facial profiles of protestors or vehicle information? How was this data retained, archived, or deleted within the department? Is any of this data shared with federal immigration agencies? If so, which ones? Is any of this data shared with any federal law enforcement agencies? If so, which ones?
    - Downtown Anti-ICE protests where protestors were kettled by SFPD - June 8, 2025
    - Arrests after peaceful Anti-ICE protest that started in the mission - June 9, 2025
    - "No Kings" Protest - June 14, 2025
- Regarding the June 8, 2025 late night crackdown on anti-ICE protesters at 100 Montgomery, SFPD Commander Lew stated in person to me that a gun was found among the dozens of protestors. What kind of gun was found? Was anyone charged with a crime related to the gun?

Given the urgency of escalating unlawful actions by ICE and the Trump Administration, I request that you submit your responses to this inquiry by Monday, July 28th.

Sincerely,

Supervisor Jackie Fielder

Introduction Form

(by a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor)

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- ☐ 1. For reference to Committee (Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment)
- ☐ 2. Request for next printed agenda (For Adoption Without Committee Reference)
  (Routine, non-controversial and/or commendatory matters only)
- ☐ 3. Request for Hearing on a subject matter at Committee
- ■ 4. Request for Letter beginning with "Supervisor Fielder inquires…"
- ☐ 5. City Attorney Request
- ☐ 6. Call File No. _____ from Committee.
- ☐ 7. Budget and Legislative Analyst Request (attached written Motion)
- ☐ 8. Substitute Legislation File No. _____
- ☐ 9. Reactivate File No. _____
- ☐ 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the Board on _____

The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following (please check all appropriate boxes):

☐ Small Business Commission ☐ Youth Commission ☐ Ethics Commission

☐ Planning Commission ☐ Building Inspection Commission ☐ Human Resources Department

General Plan Referral sent to the Planning Department (proposed legislation subject to Charter 4.105 & Admin 2A.53):

☐ Yes ☐ No

(Note: For Imperative Agenda items (a Resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Agenda Form.)

Sponsor(s):

Fielder

Subject:

Letter of Inquiry to understand law enforcement protocol behind decisions to share license plate data with federal agencies, overtime cost estimates for SFPD and SF Sheriff ' s response to protests, surveillance practices of protestors, protocols and practices for ensuring the safety of protestors when engaging with ICE, and protocols for checking the identification of federal immigration officers to thwart impersonators.

Long Title or text listed:

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: /s/ Jackie Fielder

Item 6

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: 25.02.25 Letter of Inquiry from Board President Mandelman
Date:	Monday, July 28, 2025 3:45:00 PM
Attachments:	E-signed Grant AE Memo to President Mandelman - Consolidated.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Office of the Controller, submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by President Rafael Mandelman at the February 25, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting.

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: Wagner, Greg (CON) <greg.wagner@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 3:28 PM
To: Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Mathewson, Melanie (BOS) <melanie.mathewson@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Ma, ChiaYu (CON) <chiayu.ma@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: 25.02.25 Letter of Inquiry from Board President Mandelman

Dear President Mandelman and Melanie Mathewson,

Attached is the Controller's Office response to this letter of inquiry. My sincere apologies that this final version is being submitted well past the requested response date.

As we have discussed, our office has concluded that the change is feasible, but require updates to administrative procedures and internal controls to ensure successful implementation. These changes are described in the attached memo and our office has begun work on implementation in anticipation of forthcoming legislation.

I look forward to speaking with you further on this topic.
Best,
Greg

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 8:06 AM
To: Wagner, Greg (CON) <greg.wagner@sfgov.org>
Cc: Ma, ChiaYu (CON) <chiayu.ma@sfgov.org>; Hossain, Ayeesha (CON) <ayeesha.hossain@sfgov.org>; Allersma, Michelle (CON) <michelle.allersma@sfgov.org>; Lu, Carol (CON) <carol.lu@sfgov.org>; delaRosa, Mark (CON) <mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org>; Egan, Ted (CON) <ted.egan@sfgov.org>; BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Mathewson, Melanie (BOS) <melanie.mathewson@sfgov.org>
Subject: 25.02.25 Letter of Inquiry from Board President Mandelman

Dear Controller Wagner,

Please see the attached letter from the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors regarding a Letter of Inquiry issued by Board President Rafael Mandelman at the February 25, 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.*

OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Greg Wagner
Controller

ChiaYu Ma
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Rafael Mandelman
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

FROM: Greg Wagner
Controller

DATE: July 24, 2025

SUBJECT: **Re: Increase Accept & Expend Threshold from $100,000 to $1,000,000**

This memorandum is in response to a letter of inquiry ("letter") from your office, dated February 25, 2025, that requests the Controller's Office "prepare recommendations of appropriate protocols and procedures to maintain [the Controller's Office] financial controls even as the Board of Supervisors raises the threshold for Board review of accept and expend ["A&E"] grants to $1,000,000".

Based on our analysis detailed in Appendix A (attached), the proposed threshold increase to $1,000,000 is implementable by the Controller's Office. However, its successful implementation requires consideration of several key factors, including system updates, enhanced internal controls, and additional staff resources to ensure compliance and mitigate risks.

Considerations

The proposed increase to the A&E threshold from $100,000 to $1,000,000 introduces risks that require consideration to maintain financial oversight and control. These include:

Document Repository and Retention

- Currently, all approved A&E packages[1] are uploaded to Legistar, the Board of Supervisor's (Board) legislative management software. Various stakeholders, such as external auditors, subgrantees, funders, departments, and others, use Legistar as a repository to research and obtain grant documentation. It is essential that these grant documents remain accessible to these stakeholders. If grants under the proposed threshold no longer require an A&E, the City must develop or procure a

[1] Package includes Grant Resolution Information Form, project budget, grant agreement, notice of award, and other applicable documents.

solution with comparable document hosting and management capabilities. Alternatively, the Board may consider continuing to host these packages as non-legislative documents.

Workflow Tracking

- To ensure sufficient tracking, the Controller's Office recommends designing, developing, and testing a centralized workflow system to manage all A&E package submissions. This would facilitate end-to-end tracking of submissions, including the final approval from the Controller's Office. While the City may have existing platforms that could be customized to support this process, further research and testing would be required to determine suitability.
    - In the short term. the Controller's Office will customize and deploy an existing internal platform to track A&E package submissions. We estimate this platform can be configured, tested, and activated by January 2026.
        - Appendix B is a screenshot of the preliminary design of the initial A&E form in the proposed platform.
        - Appendix C is a high-level workflow diagram illustrating the A&E submission and approval process within the platform.
    - For the long term, the Controller's Office Systems Division will explore more robust solutions that offer integrated document management and comprehensive reporting functionality to better support compliance with GASB standards, grantor regulations, and other applicable requirements.
    - The implementation of both short term and long term solutions will require additional resources, including staff positions and time dedicated to project management, system design, customization, user training, and ongoing support.

Federal Single Audit Risks

- Increasing the threshold could elevate the City's risk of single audit findings by reducing oversight of smaller grants, potentially leading to material weaknesses, significant deficiencies, and noncompliance with federal requirements. Risks include improper use of funds, ineligible expenditures, insufficient monitoring of subrecipients, inadequate internal controls, and mismanagement of cash. For example, without an A&E package (or equivalent replacement), departments may inadvertently submit expenditures for unallowable costs, overlook key supporting documentation, or fail to obtain adequate justification for certain spending. An A&E package is a key control mechanism that ensures grant-funded activities are reviewed, documented, and approved by the City. An increase in findings may also affect the City's reputation with granting agencies and negatively impact future grant eligibility and funding opportunities.

Department Resources

- A higher threshold would lead to a reduction in the number of A&Es submitted to the Board and thus fewer department resources spent on preparing, calendaring, and presenting to the Budget and Finance Committee ("Committee"). However, the A&E package will still be required by the Controller's Office and thus the time and staff resources committed to researching, compiling, and submitting the grant package will remain unchanged.

Our office appreciates the opportunity to evaluate the potential impact of the proposed threshold. We look forward to further discussion and stand ready to support implementation efforts, including next steps to ensure fiscal integrity, compliance, and efficiency.

Should you have any questions or require further clarification on any aspect of this analysis, please do not hesitate to reach out. We remain available to provide additional guidance and support as needed, and we welcome any future opportunities to assist with related matters.

Sincerely,

Controller

Appendix A

OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Greg Wagner
Controller

ChiaYu Ma
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Greg Wagner, Controller
ChiaYu Ma, Deputy Controller

FROM: Jocelyn Quintos
Chief Accounting Officer & Director of Accounting Operations and Supplier Division

DATE: April 23, 2025

SUBJECT: **Accept & Expend Requirement Modifications**

This memorandum is in response to a letter of inquiry ("letter") from President Mandelman's office, dated February 25, 2025. The letter requests that the Controller's Office "prepare recommendations of appropriate protocols and procedures to maintain [the Controller's Office] financial controls even as the Board of Supervisors raises the threshold for Board review of accept and expend grants to $1,000,000".

Background: Current Grant[1] Procedures

In general, most grants received by the City are awarded through an application process, in which Departments apply and are selected according to the granting agencies' application guidelines and criteria. This process is subject to San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 10.170-0, *Grant Application Procedure*, which gives Departments the authority to apply for grants that are under $5,000,000. However, for annual or otherwise recurring grants of $5,000,000 or more, the department head shall submit a resolution articulating the grant application to the Board of Supervisors at least 60 days prior to the grant deadline for review and approval.

[1] "Gifts" (as established under Admin Code Section 10.100-305) are not considered for the purposes of this memo

All City budgets, including those for grants and gifts, are authorized by the Board of Supervisors through legislation. For a department to Accept and Expend ("A&E") a grant or a gift and set up a budget for it, authority needs to be requested and documented. As acknowledged in the letter, San Francisco Administrative Code Section 10.170-1 requires that grants of $100,000 or more be subject to the approval by resolution of the Board of Supervisors.

Further, if subsequent increases to a grant raise the cumulative amount of the grant to $100,000 or more, or the cumulative increase is over $50,000, board approval is also required, through either of the following: (1) Include the grant budget in the Budget Ordinance and grant-funded positions in the Annual Salary Ordinance (ASO); or (2) Submit a resolution or ordinance (for grants with new positions created) to the Board for approval through the "Accept and Expend" process.

The table below provides a high-level overview of the current A&E approval process:

Table 1.1: Grant Accept & Expend Overview

Grants	Grant Amount*	Board Accept & Expend Needed		Board Accept & Expend through
		No	Yes	
New Grant	< $100,000	√		N/A
	≥ $100,000		√	Resolution
Existing Grant	Increase resulting in the total grant < $100,000	√		N/A
	Increase making the total grant ≥ $100,000		√	Resolution
Existing Grant (Previously approved by BOS)	Increase of < $50,000	√		N/A
	Increase ≥ $50,000		√	Resolution
New or Existing Grant that creates new positions	Any		√	Ordinance

*Amount includes matching City funds, if any; Indirect costs in the grant budgets are waived

Assessing Impact of Proposed Threshold Increase

Methodology

To assess the impacts and risks of an increased threshold, our office gathered and reviewed a range of data points, including past A&E volume, single audit findings, and existing policies and procedures. Team members discussed potential effects on staffing, administrative tasks, and the overall workflow.

Historical Accept & Expend Data

Table 1.2 shows the count of new grants awarded to the City in the last seven fiscal years, sorted by the total grant amount:

Table 1.2: Awarded Grants by Amount, FY2018-25

Category	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Grand Total*
Under $100,000	12	14	22	38	71	103	95	61	416
$100,000 to $999,999	36	26	54	63	114	155	150	102	700
$1M and above	33	35	73	64	79	111	90	77	562
Grand Total*	**81**	**75**	**149**	**165**	**264**	**369**	**335**	**240**	**1,678**

*Excludes 734 MTA contracts since MTA have their own authority to apply for, accept, and expend grants.

On a departmental basis, the grants were awarded as follows[1]:

Table 1.3: Awarded Grants by Amount, FY2018-25

FA Group	Dept	Count
G6	DPH/ZSFG	636
G5	DPW	158
G2	HOM	134
G2	HSA	121
G5	REC	100
G3	MOH	92
G4	PUC	85
G3	ECN	75
G1	DEM	56
G1	CHF	51

Table 1.4 compares the number of grants reviewed by the Board under the current $100k threshold and how many they would have reviewed under the proposed $1 million threshold. Under the proposed threshold, they would have reviewed 792, or 54%, fewer grants.

[1] Excluding MTA as they have their own authority to apply for, accept, and expend grants

Table 1.4: Grants Reviewed by BOS by Threshold, FY2018-25

Scenario:*	# of grant contracts reviewed	# of grant contracts not reviewed	% of total reviewed	% of total not reviewed
$100K threshold (current)	1,262	416	75%	25%
$1M threshold (proposed)	562	1,116	33%	67%
Decrease of # contract reviewed	(700)			
*Excludes 734 MTA contracts since MTA have their own authority to apply for, accept, and expend grants.				

Federal Single Audit

As required by the federal Single Audit Act of 1984 (and codified in the OMB Uniform Guidance), each fiscal year all public and nonprofit recipients of federal funds must hire independent auditors to conduct a single audit of all federal awards expended. This audit provides assurance to the federal government that non-federal entities are managing and using federal funds properly and in compliance with federal requirements.

Table 1.5 reflects total federal expenditures and corresponding audit findings in each of the last seven fiscal years. Please note this does not include assistance related to Medi-Cal, Medicare, or expenditures of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority, the San Francisco International Airport, the Municipal Transportation Agency, or the Redevelopment Successor Agency.

Table 1.5: Single Audit – Total Expenditures and Number of Findings from FY2018 through FY2024

CCSF Single Audit Report			
Fiscal Year	Federal Expenditures	Number of findings	Department
2018	$ 432,851,518	None	
2019	$ 446,631,665	None	
2020	$ 602,968,748	One	CostRecovery
2021	$ 959,172,270	None	
2022	$ 1,142,863,568	None	
2023	$ 857,480,904	One	HSA
2024	$ 1,432,928,087	None	

Despite its significant spending, the City has only incurred two findings since 2018. This indicates strict adherence to federal requirements, suggesting that our existing controls are effective. The low number of findings also benefits the City in future fiscal years, as granting agencies are more likely to award larger amounts and/or more frequently to entities that have demonstrated consistent compliance.

Raising the grant submission threshold from $100K to $1M could lead to compliance risks, including an increased likelihood of audit findings. Under *Uniform Guidance (2 CFR Part 200),* common audit findings for grant recipients often relate to noncompliance with federal regulations or internal control weaknesses:

Material Weaknesses – If departments lack sufficient internal controls for grants under $1M, there could be a material weakness, which is the most severe type of deficiency in financial reporting. This means the City's financial statements or grant management processes might be at risk of misstatement or noncompliance, possibly leading to federal corrective actions or increased assessment from auditors. Findings may include:

1. Improper Use of Grant Funds: Systematic misapplication of funds for unallowable expenses.
2. Time and Effort Reporting: Major noncompliance, such as widespread failure to document employee time accurately or systematically.
3. Subrecipient Monitoring: Lack of oversight over subrecipients, leading to extensive noncompliance with grant terms.
4. Internal Controls: Absence of critical internal controls, increasing the risk of mismanagement or fraud.
5. Cash Management: Drawing down funds prematurely or failing to comply with federal cash management rules in a way that systematically impacts grant compliance.

Significant Deficiencies – A threshold increase could also result in significant deficiencies, where internal controls exist but are not strong enough to fully prevent errors or noncompliance. Examples include departments failing to maintain documentation, inconsistencies in reporting grant expenditures, or delays in required federal reporting.

Higher Number of Audit Findings – As smaller grants receive less oversight, federal auditors may identify control gaps, leading to an increase in audit findings. If findings become frequent, federal agencies may impose additional compliance monitoring or even limit funding in future years.

Impact on Grant Eligibility – An increase in findings, material weaknesses, or significant deficiencies could affect the City's reputation as a reliable grant recipient. Granting agencies may hesitate to award funds or require more stringent pre-award reviews to ensure compliance before approving future applications.

Corrective Action & Compliance Burden – The City might need to implement corrective actions, such as enhanced monitoring, stricter reporting requirements, or staff training to address deficiencies. These efforts could require additional resources to reestablish confidence in financial reporting and grant management

Non-Federal Grant Compliance **–** Only federal and federal pass-through grants are subject to the Single Audit. If non-federal grants are not audited on a yearly basis, the risk for non-compliance on these grants may be increased if the threshold amount is raised to $1M. If granting agencies select these grants for program audits, there may be an increase in potential findings.

Workflow Options Under the New Threshold

Current Process

- <$100K = No additional review needed; departments directly enter budget entries.
- >$100K = Controller's Office fund accountants (AOSD) reviews; Department submits to Budget & Finance Committee ("BFC"), who review and recommend to the Board.

Below are the proposed workflows for the implementation of the new $1M threshold. Note these workflows are subject to change based on the language of the proposed amendment.

Option 1 (Not Recommended)

- <$1M = No additional review needed; departments directly enter budget entries.
- >$1M = AOSD reviews; Department submits to BFC, who review and recommend to BOS

    - Option 1 assumes that grants will not require a review process under the operative threshold, which will significantly weaken controls. This option is not recommended.

Option 2 (Recommended)

- <$100K = No additional review needed; departments directly enter budget entries.
- >$100K = AOSD reviews and Controller has authority to confirm and allow department to appropriate.
- >$1M = AOSD reviews; department submits to BFC, who reviews and recommends to the full Board.

    - Option 2 assumes that grants under the $1M threshold but over the current $100K threshold will still require Controller's review. However, under the $1M threshold, no additional BFC/full Board review will be required. The Controller will have the authority to authorize budget entries under the $1M threshold. This is an increased risk due to the higher threshold and the absence of additional BFC/full Board review.

Challenges, Benefits, and Considerations

Document Repository

- All approved A&E packages are uploaded in Legistar, the Board's legislation management system. Various stakeholders, such as external auditors, subgrantees, funders, departments, and others, utilize Legistar as a repository to reference and obtain grant documentation. With no resolutions, packages under the new threshold will no longer be hosted on the platform. The City will need to find a comparable solution that offers similar hosting and archiving capabilities. Alternatively, the Controller and Board can explore the possibility of uploading packages between $100K and $1M into Legistar, despite not being a legislative record. If feasible, this would avoid the need to procure and/or develop a replacement platform.

Department and CON Workload

- The letter states that the current A&E process may "dissuade departments from applying for grants in the first place." Indeed, the higher threshold would lead to a reduction in overall A&E resolutions, and thus fewer department resources spent on preparation, calendaring, and presenting to the BFC.

  However, the time and staff resources committed to researching, compiling, and submitting the grant package is unlikely to change. Along with the resolution, the Administrative Code requires that departments submit a grant information form, grant budget, grant application, and award letter. Departments are also required to submit Ethics Form 126, Contracts/Lease Agreements, and other relevant documents as applicable. This grant package contains essential information and is needed from departments for any grant, regardless of the amount.

  Also, currently all A&E above the operative threshold must be received and assigned to the BFC. Once agendized, the meeting date effectively creates a deadline for departments to finalize the grant package. Without a time constraint, the urgency of finalizing the package may not be realized, leading to an increased volume of departmental revisions and follow-ups.

Emergency Grants & Declarations

- The change should also consider effects (if any) on the authorization and spending associated with Federal and State Disaster Assistance under an emergency. Admin Code Section 10.100-100 establishes a San Francisco Disaster and Emergency Response and Recovery Fund which authorizes the City to receive and use funds for certain spending categories, without the need for an additional A&E. The Board should confirm that the threshold change would not require changes nor conflict with the current emergency procedures.

Grant Interest Considerations

- Departments are currently required to obtain additional authorization from the Board to appropriate interest earned on grant advances when such interest was not included in the original A&E, and the original grant agreement does not require the use of interest earned for program purposes. Procedures and thresholds specific to interest may also need to be considered in conjunction with any changes to the A&E threshold.

Implementation

Implement Option 2 under "Workflow Options Under the New Threshold" section

Should the Board proceed with the threshold increase, we recommend implementing "Option 2" as described under the "Workflow Options Under the New Threshold" section.

- The operative amount of $100k, and the BOS-related requirements summarized in Table 1.1, would increase to a threshold of $1M, with all the original Board-related requirements transferring to the Controller's Office. Increases above the threshold would still require Board approval.

- Grants under the $1M threshold would no longer need a Board resolution and would be processed in the same way as current grants under $100k. Departments, in conjunction with the Controller, will create budget journal entries. The budget entry will reference the amended administrative code in its "attachment" section as supporting documentation.

The new workflow is summarized below:

Table 1.6: Grant Accept & Expend Overview Under Increased Threshold

Grants	Grant Amount	Controller's Office Review Needed		Board Accept & Expend Needed		Accept & Expend through:
		No	Yes	No	Yes	
New Grant	< $100,000	√		√		N/A
	≥ $100,000 - $1,000,000		√	√		CON Approval Authority
	≥ $1,000,000		√		√	BOS Resolution
Existing Grant	Increase resulting in the total grant < $100,000	√		√		N/A
	Increase resulting in the total grant ≥ $100,000 - $1,000,000		√	√		CON Approval Authority
	Increase resulting in the total grant ≥ $1,000,000		√		√	BOS Resolution
Existing Grant (Previously approved by CON or BOS)	Increase of < $50,000		√	√		N/A
	Increase ≥ $50,000		√		√	BOS Resolution
New or Existing Grant that creates new positions	Any		√		√	BOS Ordinance

New Tracking Application for Workflow and Document Management

- Under the new workflow, the Controller recommends that a new tracking and document management solution be developed or procured to support the workflow for grant and A&E approvals. This system will eliminate reliance on email approvals and attachments by enabling all documents to be saved and managed electronically within a centralized platform. This would streamline the approval workflow, reduce manual errors, and support proper record retention. The solution should also be capable of serving as a document repository in lieu of A&Es not being uploaded to Legistar.

Additional Staff and Resources

- To meet the increased workload, the Controller anticipates requiring additional staff and resources. Currently, the fund accountant team reviews departmental grants, while staff also conduct a separate review of Single Audit and federal grants. Additional duties may include department outreach, internal and external training, and system processing. Supplemental personnel may be necessary to maintain satisfactory levels of control.

- Designing, developing, and testing a centralized workflow to manage all A&E package submissions will require significant resources. This system would facilitate end-to-end tracking of submissions, including the final approval from the Controller's Office. While the City may have existing platforms that could be customized to support this process, further research and testing would be required to determine suitability. Key considerations include staff positions and time, system design, customization, user training, and ongoing support.

Implementation Timeline

- Based on the estimated increase in resources, training, and staffing, we recommend that the threshold increase be implemented no earlier than the beginning of fiscal year 2026-27.

Current vs Retroactive Grants

- The Controller's Office recommends that the threshold be applied to all new grants after an agreed-upon operative date, based on the estimated implementation timeline.

Other Alternatives

Introduce Accept & Expend Resolutions for Adoption without Committee Reference

- Primarily reserved for routine or urgent matters, resolutions can be introduced to the Board to be adopted without reference to committee. In this case, an A&E resolution would be adopted on the day it is introduced to the Board, without being further referred to BFC. It would also achieve desired efficiencies, such as eliminating department presentations, replacing the document repository, moving approval obligations to the Controller, and increased workloads. However, the nature of A&E packages may not meet the standards or intent of resolutions that are normally submitted for adoption without committee reference.

Move Accept & Expend Resolutions to a Committee Consent Agenda

- A&E resolutions are currently calendared as a regular item on the BFC's meeting agenda. From our research, it is unclear whether consent agendas are allowable or utilized for committee hearings. If permissible, moving resolutions to the BFC's Consent Agenda would presumably save time and resources. There would be no separate discussion of the items unless requested by a Supervisor, and the grantee department would no longer have to calendar and prepare for presentation. This reclassification could be implemented regardless of threshold and would avoid the aforementioned challenges such as replacing the document repository, moving approval obligations to the Controller, and managing increased workloads from the Controller or departments. However this would require a recommendation without a detailed review, which inherently carries more risk and may be objectionable from the BFC perspective.

Closing and Summary

Based on our analysis, increasing the A&E threshold from $100K to $1M introduces certain risks and concerns, specifically related to oversight, accountability, and document retention. While the process change would likely reduce BFC/Board staff time and expedite the delivery of goods and services, the Controller will need to implement additional controls to ensure the continuity of citywide compliance and oversight.

Appendix B

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Office of the Controller

Accept and Expend Form

A&E #: A&E-DEPT-FY##-####

Journal ID (for KK entry):

Request Date:

Resolution/Ordinance # (from BOS):

Fiscal Year:

File # (from BOS):

Department Code:

Customer Contract:

Ordinance or Resolution: - Please select -

Project Code:

Gift or Grant: - Please select -

Grant Title:

Beginning Grant Balance: - Indicate 0 if first award -

Award Amount:

Start Date:

End Date:

Grantor Agency:

Award Type:

If Federal Pass Through, provide federal grantor:

If Federal, ALN:

Payment Type: - Please select -

Recurring/New/Modification: - Please select -

Is Matching Required ?: ☐

Match Amount:

Match Source:

Indirect Cost Required?: ☐

Indirect Cost Amount:

Competitive Bidding Required?: ☐

Is this Capital Assets/Lease/Other GASB?: ☐ *If Yes, routes to Asset Management Team*

Summary/Purpose of Grant:

(i.e., similar to resolution paragraph #1 and #2)

Supporting Documents to Provide:

- Cover sheet to clerk of the BOS or to Controller
- Proposed grant ordinance; original signed by Department, Mayor, Controller
- Grant information form, including disability checklist
- Grant budget
- Grant application
- Letter of intent or grant award letter from funding agency
- Ethics Form 126 (if applicable)
- Contracts, Leases/Agreements (if applicable)
- Other (Explain):
- Resolution (required if grant is over $1M or gift over $10K)
- Ordinance (required for new or existing grants that create new positions)

Approval Step	Action	Approved by	Timestamp
Start	Submit	Dept1@sfgov.org	7/8/2025 3:05:32 PM
Department Approval	Approve	Dept2@sfgov.org	7/8/2025 5:08:07 PM
Controller AOSD Accountant Approval	Approve	CON1@sfgov.org	7/9/2025 1:38:19 PM
Controller Asset Management Approval	Approve	CON2@sfgov.org	7/9/2025 1:38:19 PM
Controller AOSD Director Approval	Approve	CON3@sfgov.org	7/14/2025 9:11:08 AM
Comment: Approve for AOSD Director. Email approval attached.			
Mayor Approval	Approve	Mayor1@sfgov.org	7/9/2025 4:17:23 PM
Department Enters KK#	Approve	Dept1@sfgov.org	7/14/2025 3:54:28 PM
Controller AOSD Accountant Final Approval	Approve	CON1@sfgov.org	7/15/2025 10:07:01 AM

Appendix C

Accept and Expend Workflow:



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

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

February 27, 2025

Brad Russi, Deputy City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 234
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via Email: Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org

Dear Deputy City Attorney Russi,

At the February 25, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting, President Rafael Mandelman issued the attached inquiry to the Office of the City Attorney. Please review the attached introduction form, which provides the President's request.

The inquiry requests the Office of the City Attorney to draft legislation to increase the minimum threshold to Administrative Code, Section 10.170-1(Grant Funds-Acceptance and Expenditure), from $100,000 to $1,000,000.

Please contact, Melanie Mathewson, Melanie.Mathewson@sfgov.org, Legislative Aide to President Mandelman, 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 March 14, 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/JB

Attachment:
- Introduction Form

Introduction Form

(by a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor)

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- ☐ 1. For reference to Committee (Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment)
- ☐ 2. Request for next printed agenda (For Adoption Without Committee Reference)
  (Routine, non-controversial and/or commendatory matters only)
- ☐ 3. Request for Hearing on a subject matter at Committee
- ☐ 4. Request for Letter beginning with "Supervisor _____ inquires..."
- ■ 5. City Attorney Request
- ☐ 6. Call File No. _____ from Committee.
- ☐ 7. Budget and Legislative Analyst Request (attached written Motion)
- ☐ 8. Substitute Legislation File No. _____
- ☐ 9. Reactivate File No. _____
- ☐ 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the Board on _____

The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following (please check all appropriate boxes):

☐ Small Business Commission ☐ Youth Commission ☐ Ethics Commission

☐ Planning Commission ☐ Building Inspection Commission ☐ Human Resources Department

General Plan Referral sent to the Planning Department (proposed legislation subject to Charter 4.105 & Admin 2A.53):

☐ Yes ☒ No

(Note: For Imperative Agenda items (a Resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Agenda Form.)

Sponsor(s):

Mandelman

Subject:

Drafting Request for Grant Accept & Expend Process Reform

Long Title or text listed:

Section 10.170-1 of the Administrative Code sets a minimum threshold of $100,000 for the Board of Supervisors to review and approve the acceptance and expenditure of grants. Please draft legislation to increase this threshold to $1 million, tied to the Federal Single Audit standard.

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: 

Item 7

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: August 4, 2025 Notice of Cancellation - SFAC Full Commission Posted
Date:	Friday, August 1, 2025 10:52:00 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

Hello,

Please see below for communication from the San Francisco Arts Commission, submitting a cancellation notice for the Full Arts Commission meeting on Monday, August 4, 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: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART) <manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 3:45 PM
Subject: August 4, 2025 Notice of Cancellation - SFAC Full Commission Posted

Hello,

The Notice of Cancellation for the Monday, August 4, 2025, Full Commission meeting has been posted:

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

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.

Item 8

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); Young, Victor (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Semi-Annual Report on City-Funded 100% Affordable Housing Projects
Date:	Friday, August 1, 2025 10:59:00 AM
Attachments:	AH Report-2025 Q1&2.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, pursuant to Ordinance No. 298-24, submitting a semi-annual report on MOHCD's 100% affordable housing projects.

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: Geithman, Kyra (MYR) <kyra.geithman@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2025 10:56 AM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Nickolopoulos, Sheila (MYR) <sheila.nickolopoulos@sfgov.org>; Adams, Dan (MYR) <Dan.Adams@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Bonde, Aly (MYR) <aly.bonde@sfgov.org>; Segal, Ned (MYR) <ned.segal@sfgov.org>
Subject: Semi-Annual Report on City-Funded 100% Affordable Housing Projects

Dear Mayor Lurie, President Mandelman, and Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Please find attached the semi-annual report on MOHCD's 100% affordable housing projects, as required by City Ordinance 298-24 (File 241083) and as part of OEWD's Executive Directive 17-02. This report covers the first six months of Calendar Year (CY) 2025, from January 1 through June 30, 2025.

As always, you can also view this and all of MOHCD's reports on SF.gov here.

Please feel free to reach out to us if you have any questions!

--
Kyra Geithman
Associate Director, Policy and Community Affairs
San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
Pronouns: she/they
My normal in-office days are Monday, Tuesday and Thursday.

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
City and County of San Francisco

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Daniel Adams
Director

July 31, 2025

To: Mayor Daniel Lurie; Honorable Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
From: Dan Adams, Director, MOHCD
CC: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Re: CY 2025 – Semi-Annual Report on City-Funded 100% Affordable Housing Projects for (Ordinance 298-24; File #241083

Enclosed please find the semi-annual report on MOHCD's 100% affordable housing projects, as required by City Ordinance 298-24 (File 241083) and as part of OEWD's Executive Directive 17-02. This report covers the first six months of Calendar Year (CY) 2025, from January 1 through June 30, 2025.

This report includes:

- A list of every 100% affordable housing project that has applied for approval, permit, or other City authorization from the Department of Building Inspection, Public Works, Fire Department, Mayor's Office on Disability, or Planning Department; and
- Information regarding the financing and financing-related deadlines for each of these 100% affordable housing projects.

Highlights from the first half of 2025 include the completion of two new construction developments: 383 6th Avenue, with 98 units of senior housing in the Inner Richmond; and The Kelsey Civic Center, with 112 units and a brand-new, first-of-its-kind Disability Cultural Center. The 85-unit project at 160 Freelon received its building permit and broke ground on construction after securing $44 million in federal tax credit equity.

Additionally, four projects—772 Pacific, 1939 Market, 650 Divisadero, and 1234 Great Highway—applied for State financing through the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)'s Multifamily Finance Super NOFA; awards are expected to be announced in August. Critical rehabilitations were also completed at the 62-unit El Dorado.

If you have questions regarding this report, please contact Sheila Nickolopoulos, Director of Policy and Legislative Affairs for MOHCD, at sheila.nickolopoulos@sfgov.org.

Thank you,

Dan Adams
Director, Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development

Development Name	# Units	Completion Date	Source	Program/Loan Type	Amount	Status
(1) Preliminary Phase						
Potrero Yard Affordable Housing	99	11/30/2029	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$3,000,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Preliminary Gap	$3,408,851	Not Committed
			HCD	Infill Infrastructure Grant	$6,083,954	Not Committed
			HCD	Multifamily Housing Program	$31,651,677	Not Committed
			FHLB	AHP	$1,000,000	Not Committed
			Other	Deferred Developer Fee	$357,454	Not Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$100	Not Committed
(2) Predevelopment Feasibility						
1234 Great Highway	199	7/31/2029	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$651,500	Committed
			MOHCD	Acquisition Loan	$23,348,500	Committed
			MOHCD	Preliminary Gap	$9,735,715	Committed
			HCD	Multifamily Housing Program	$36,000,000	Not Committed
			External	Interim Use from Lease of Hotel	$741,959	Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity - Federal	$76,373,077	Not Committed
			HCD	State Tax Credits	$27,356,064	Not Committed
			External	Permanent Loan	$25,007,000	Not Committed
			FHLB	AHP	$1,990,000	Not Committed
			Other	Accrued Interest	$737,970	Committed
			Other	Deferred Fee	$5,900,000	Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$500,000	Committed
1979 Mission Family	148	12/31/2030	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$3,000,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Preliminary Gap	$72,000,000	Not Committed
			HCD	IIG	$14,229,300	Not Committed
			HCD	AHSC	$6,347,425	Not Committed
			External	Investor Equity	$97,073,626	Not Committed
			External	Permanent Loan	$38,509,896	Not Committed
			Other	Accrued Interest	$605,646	Not Committed
2059 Mission	35	5/1/2026	MOHCD	PASS (Hard Debt)-2025 Series	$5,438,000	Committed
			MOHCD	SSP (Soft Debt)	$16,717,705	Committed
2205 Mission	63	12/15/2027	MOHCD	Final Gap	$12,000,000	Not Committed
			HCD	CalHOME	$3,107,750	Committed
			Other	Sponsor Contribution	$3,810,161	Committed
			Other	Sales Proceeds	$31,360,236	Not Committed
			Other	Other Predev	$2,034,577	Committed
			FHLB	AHP	$2,000,000	Committed
249 Pennsylvania Family	120	1/1/2029	MOHCD	Acquisition	$11,964,119	Committed
			MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$1,035,881	Committed
			MOHCD	Preliminary Gap	$19,946,355	Not Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$51,018,244	Not Committed
			HCD	MHP	$34,580,356	Not Committed
			FHLB	AHP	$1,030,000	Not Committed
			Other	Deferred Developer Fee	$769,017	Not Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$3,169,018	Not Committed
			Other	Income from interim use	$150,000	Not Committed
250 Laguna Honda	172	7/1/2028	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$2,500,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Acquisition Loan	$5,500,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Final Gap	$26,865,797	Not Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$31,622,407	Not Committed
			HCD	MHP	$29,290,497	Not Committed
			External	Permanent Loan	$6,111,791	Not Committed
			FHLB	AHP	$1,000,000	Not Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$500,000	Committed
2530 18th Homeless Prenatal Program H	74	1/1/2029	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$2,511,689	Committed
			MOHCD	Acquisition	$6,900,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Preliminary Gap	$11,100,000	Committed
			HCD	MHP	$28,320,125	Not Committed
			HCD	IIG	$6,048,992	Not Committed
			FHLB	AHP	$1,000,000	Not Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$36,114,097	Not Committed
			Other	Deferred Fee	$1,000,000	Not Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$100	Not Committed
2901 16th	63	6/1/2027	MOHCD	SSP (Soft Debt)	$30,000,000	Committed
2970 16th Street (PSH)	136	3/31/2028	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$3,000,000	Committed

Development Name	# Units	Completion Date	Source	Program/Loan Type	Amount	Status
			MOHCD	NPLH-HCD Pass through	$26,264,280	Committed
			MOHCD	Final Gap	$24,200,000	Committed
			MOHCD	MOHCD Deferred interest	$1,369,584	Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$45,512,999	Not Committed
			External	Permanent Loan	$8,396,000	Not Committed
			Other	Deferred Fee	$1,240,000	Not Committed
772 Pacific Ave	175	11/30/2029	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$936,205	Committed
			MOH	Acquisition	$2,131,526	Committed
			MOH	Preliminary Gap	$42,300,646	Committed
			MOH	LOSP Grant	$14,378,311	Committed
			MOH	SOS Grant	$20,282,056	Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$79,601,133	Not Committed
			HCD	MHP	$32,000,000	Not Committed
			HCD	State Tax Credits	$13,106,259	Not Committed
			HCD	IIG	$5,000,000	Not Committed
			Other	Accrued Interest	$2,716,315	Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$1,439,990	Not Committed
			Other	AHP	$1,740,000	Not Committed
			Other	GP Contribution	$70,000	Not Committed
835 Turk	106	10/1/2026	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan-OCHO Funds /HSH Lease & property M	$3,788,138	Committed
			MOHCD	Preliminary Gap-2020 General Obligation Bond	$9,629,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Preliminary Gap-Our City Our Home	$3,293,000	Committed
			HCD	Homekey+-HCD Homekey+	$13,300,000	Not Committed
Laguna Honda Hospital Senior Housing	220	5/1/2029	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$3,000,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Preliminary Gap	$44,257,441	Not Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$39,000,000	Not Committed
			HCD	MHP	$20,000,000	Not Committed
			HCD	IIG	$7,500,000	Not Committed
			FHLB	AHP	$1,200,000	Not Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$3,000,000	Not Committed
Normandy Apartments	108	12/1/2025	MOHCD	PASS (Hard Debt)-2025 Series	$21,800,000	Committed
			MOHCD	SSP (Soft Debt)-CDBG	$12,274,000	Committed
			MOHCD	SSP (Soft Debt)-SSP Funding Sources	$16,840,744	Committed
Treasure Island E1.2 - Senior	100	4/30/2027	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$3,000,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Preliminary Gap	$8,443,000	Not Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$27,817,169	Not Committed
			HUD	Section 202 Rental Assistance	$6,813,486	Not Committed
			HCD	MHP	$21,969,964	Not Committed
			External	Commercial Loan	$6,224,573	Not Committed
			FHLB	AHP Grant	$1,000,000	Not Committed
			Other	TIDA Funds up to $3,279,000	$3,279,000	Not Committed
			Other	Deferred Fee	$1,300,000	Not Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$100	Not Committed
Treasure Island IC4.3 - HomeRise	150	12/30/2028	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$3,000,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Preliminary Gap	$45,970,669	Not Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$54,188,195	Not Committed
			HCD	Program not specified at this time	$34,949,284	Not Committed
			External	Commercial Loan	$17,034,860	Not Committed
			FHLB	AHP	$1,000,000	Not Committed
			Other	TIDA Funds	$1,500,000	Committed
			Other	Deferred Fee	$800,000	Not Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$100	Not Committed
(3) Design with Entitlements Approved						
629 Post	62	11/5/2026	MOHCD	SSP (Soft Debt)	$30,385,225	Committed
			MOHCD	PASS (Hard Debt)	$12,748,000	Not Committed
650 Divisadero St	107	11/1/2028	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$2,225,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Acquisition	$12,775,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Preliminary Gap	$4,000,000	Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$46,323,201	Committed
			HCD	MHP	$21,429,068	Not Committed
			External	Permanent Loan	$22,513,465	Not Committed
			Other	Deferred Fee	$2,638,541	Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$2,000,000	Committed
Balboa Reservoir Building A	159	2/1/2028	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$3,000,000	Committed

Development Name	# Units	Completion Date	Source	Program/Loan Type	Amount	Status
			MOHCD	Final Gap	$28,346,291	Committed
			MOHCD	Infrastructure Loan	$22,619,338	Not Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$62,647,387	Not Committed
			HCD	AHSC	$33,000,000	Committed
			External	Permanent Loan	$19,018,000	Committed
			Other	Deferred Fee	$3,265,127	Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$17,060,009	Committed
Bernal Bundle Scattered Sites - Positive Match	7	12/31/2025	MOHCD	PASS (Hard Debt)-Series C	$999,115	Committed
			MOHCD	Permanent Loan	$1,799,596	Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$44,865	Committed
Bernal Bundle Scattered Sites - Woolsey Apartments	10	12/31/2025	MOHCD	PASS (Hard Debt)-Series C	$1,427,308	Committed
			MOHCD	Permanent Loan	$2,570,852	Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$64,093	Committed
HPSY II-CPS, Block 11A	175	6/1/2030	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$3,500,000	Committed
Larkin Pine Senior Housing	68	6/1/2027	MOHCD	PASS (Hard Debt)-Series 2020 C and 2025 E	$13,658,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan-part of 2023 ENP NOFA award	$1,289,611	Committed
			MOHCD	Permanent Loan-other part of 2023 ENP NOFA award	$1,196,242	Committed
			MOHCD	Acquisition-1999 Hotel Tax Fund Site loan	$4,061,151	Committed
			HCD	LPR-RHCP	$3,473,704	Committed
			External	CCDC sponsor loan (USPS air rights lease)	$1,000,000	Not Committed
			Other	Deferred Fee	$1,048,393	Committed
			Other	transferred reserve	$51,818	Committed
			External	LIWP and BAMBE programs	$75,000	Not Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$13,874,972	Not Committed
(4) Site Work Permit Issued						
1939 Market	187	8/15/2028	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan-Original Prev	$4,000,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Preliminary Gap	$52,360,000	Committed
			HCD	AHSC	$32,830,803	Not Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$73,652,720	Not Committed
			Other	Deferred Fee	$9,019,941	Committed
			Other	Accrued Interest	$1,799,874	Committed
967 Mission (Land Dedication Site)	95	10/15/2027	MOHCD	Preliminary Gap-For CDLAC/TCAC Application	$23,750,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Additional Gap-For CDLAC/TCAC Application	$12,947,619	Committed
			MOHCD	LHTF	$2,052,183	Committed
			MOHCD	HOME-ARP	$4,568,198	Committed
			MOHCD	LOSP Grant	$8,704,033	Committed
			MOHCD	SOS Grant	$10,548,906	Committed
			FHLB	AHP 3/1/2026	$1,000,000	Not Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity-.95 per credit	$37,189,330	Not Committed
			Other	Deferred Dev Fee	$1,300,000	Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$1,000,000	Committed
The Dudley Apartments	75	11/24/2025	MOHCD	Final Gap	$2,942,275	Committed
The Rose	76	9/30/2026	MOHCD	Final Gap-CPMC Funds	$4,000,000	Committed
(5) First Construction Document Issued						
160 Freelon (Land Dedication Site)	85	4/30/2027	MOHCD	Final Gap	$22,577,900	Committed
			MOHCD	Accrued Interest	$1,784,000	Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$44,282,000	Committed
			HCD	AHSC	$29,000,000	Committed
			External	Permanent Loan-Citibank, N.A	$2,770,000	Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$100	Committed
2550 Irving	90	3/23/2026	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$4,993,516	Committed
			MOHCD	Final Gap	$10,963,134	Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$45,303,503	Committed
			HCD	MHP	$29,363,536	Committed
			HCD	IIG	$6,999,486	Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$100	Committed
			FHLB	AHP	$1,000,000	Not Committed
3300 Mission	35	6/1/2026	MOHCD	Final Gap-Housing Trust Fund	$6,805,088	Committed
			MOHCD	Commercial Space Loan	$1,186,154	Committed
			MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$2,349,000	Committed
			MOHCD	AHP bridge loan	$2,100,000	Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$24,400,800	Committed
375 14th St	16	6/19/2025	MOHCD	PASS (Hard Debt)-Series C	$1,898,000	Committed
			MOHCD	SSP (Soft Debt)	$5,700,000	Committed

Development Name	# Units	Completion Date	Source	Program/Loan Type	Amount	Status
3975 24th St	6	1/1/2026	MOHCD	PASS (Hard Debt)-Series C	$1,598,000	Committed
			MOHCD	SSP (Soft Debt)	$2,341,941	Committed
40-42 Sycamore	5	10/3/2025	MOHCD	PASS (Hard Debt)-Series C	$950,000	Committed
			MOHCD	SSP (Soft Debt)	$2,920,000	Committed
			Other	SF Foundation Donation	$346,500	Committed
78 Haight (Parcel U)	64	9/29/2025	MOHCD	Additional Gap	$8,559,766	Committed
			MOHCD	Final Gap-NPLH	$4,780,239	Committed
			MOHCD	Final Gap	$21,021,228	Committed
			MOHCD	AHP-MOHCD bridge loan	$945,000	Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity-federal and state	$27,045,557	Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$1,100,000	Committed
			Other	Accrued Interest	$1,546,700	Committed
730 Stanyan	160	10/31/2025	MOHCD	Final Gap	$59,945,686	Committed
			MOHCD	NPLH	$8,583,241	Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$72,425,323	Committed
			External	Permanent Loan	$10,361,000	Committed
			Other	Accrued Interest	$936,654	Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$100	Committed
			FHLB	AHP	$1,000,000	Not Committed
850 Turk	92	3/1/2027	MOHCD	Final Gap	$5,000,000	Committed
			External	Permanent Loan	$5,089,000	Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$43,408,375	Committed
			HCD	AHSC	$22,000,000	Committed
			HCD	IIG	$1,317,000	Committed
			HCD	LGMG	$7,760,753	Committed
			Other	Deferred Fee	$1,365,826	Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$7,896,782	Committed
Hazel Betsey (Bernal Bundle Scattered S	9	2/1/2026	MOHCD	PASS (Hard Debt)-Series C	$1,284,577	Committed
			MOHCD	Permanent Loan	$2,313,766	Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$57,684	Committed
Casa Adelante at 1515 South Van Ness	168	3/31/2026	MOHCD	Final Gap + 1.6M MOHCD AHP Bridge Loan at same terms (no	$43,633,623	Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity-Raymond James Affordable Housing Investr	$78,523,805	Committed
			HCD	MHP	$37,930,397	Committed
			FHLB	AHP	$1,600,000	Not Committed
			External	Permanent Loan-Housing Trust Silicon Valley for Apple	$3,956,000	Committed
			Other	Accrued Interest	$1,045,833	Committed
			Other	Deferred Fee	$500,000	Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$500,000	Committed
Hunters View Phase III	118	8/29/2025	MOHCD	Final Gap-Includes predev	$50,495,000	Committed
			External	HTSV Apple Fund	$2,200,000	Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$61,999,922	Not Committed
			External	Permanent Loan	$24,700,000	Not Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$100	Committed
			Other	Deferred Fee	$1,300,000	Committed
Knox SRO	140	8/1/2025	MOHCD	Housing for a Healthy California (HHC) HCD Pass Through	$6,798,810	Committed
			External	Extension of former SFRA Loan	$2,100,000	Committed
			HCD	CalDAP Extension	$7,772,482	Committed
			HCD	HCD PRP Loan and COSR	$15,537,588	Committed
			External	Building existing reserves	$623,193	Committed
Maria Alicia Apartments	20	10/1/2025	MOHCD	PASS (Hard Debt)-Series C	$679,000	Committed
Potrero Block B	156	8/29/2025	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$2,206,907	Committed
			MOHCD	Final Gap	$17,680,000	Committed
			HCD	Accelerator	$94,836,486	Committed
			HCD	AHSC	$20,000,000	Committed
			HCD	IIG	$11,699,000	Committed
			External	Permanent Loan	$43,305,000	Committed
			Other	Deferred Fee	$526,868	Committed
			Other	Accrued Interest (IIG)	$570,793	Committed
SFCLT Scattered Sites - 4042 Fulton	6	9/1/2025	MOHCD	PASS (Hard Debt)-Series C	$810,811	Committed
			MOHCD	SSP (Soft Debt)	$2,892,660	Committed
Transbay Block 2 West (Senior)	151	1/15/2026	MOHCD	Final Gap	$59,698,646	Committed
			MOHCD	Commercial Space Loan	$3,041,853	Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$57,449,304	Committed
			Other	Accrued Interest	$1,031,250	Committed

Development Name	# Units	Completion Date	Source	Program/Loan Type	Amount	Status
			Other	GP Equity	$100	Committed
(6) Complete						
2425 Post	3	5/31/2025	MOHCD	SSP (Soft Debt)-CMLH	$3,326,000	Committed
383 6th Avenue (4200 Geary)	98	4/17/2025	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$3,474,613	Committed
			MOHCD	Final Gap	$19,393,102	Committed
			HCD	Multifamily Housing Program	$20,000,000	Committed
			HCD	Accelerator	$32,284,809	Committed
			FHLB	AHP	$1,000,000	Not Committed
			External	Permanent Loan	$2,155,000	Not Committed
El Dorado	62	1/11/2025	HCD	CHRP-R	$2,534,956	Committed
			MOHCD	PASS (Hard Debt)-Series C	$2,090,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Permanent Loan-AH General Fund (ENP NOFA)	$4,000,000	Committed
			CTCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$24,040,654	Committed
Granada Hotel	214	1/31/2025	HCD	Homekey	$42,334,020	Committed
			MOHCD	Permanent Loan	$71,125,575	Committed
HPSY I, Block 52 & 54	112	4/30/2025	MOHCD	Final Gap	$57,000,430	Committed
			MOHCD	Site Development Agreement	$4,517,778	Committed
			TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$62,379,905	Committed
			HCD	IIG	$5,913,900	Committed
			External	Permanent Loan	$2,378,010	Committed
			Other	Deferred Fee	$800,026	Committed
Hunters Point Shipyard Block 56	73	1/31/2025	TCAC	Tax Credit Equity	$34,874,934	Committed
			MOHCD	Final Gap	$34,813,441	Committed
			External	Permanent Loan	$2,758,000	Committed
			Other	GP Equity	$100	Committed
Kelsey Civic Center	112	4/9/2025	MOHCD	Predevelopment Loan	$2,000,000	Committed
			MOHCD	Final Gap	$21,684,459	Committed
			MOHCD	deferred interest	$868,044	Committed
			HCD	AHSC	$20,000,000	Committed
			HCD	Accelerator	$37,334,401	Committed
			External	Permanent Loan	$1,551,000	Committed
			FHLB	AHP	$1,000,000	Committed
			Other	Sponsor Loan	$2,942,391	Committed
			Other	GGRC Sponsor Loan	$1,000,000	Committed
			Other	Accrued Deferred Interest	$143,559	Committed
Merry Go Round Shared Housing	14	6/27/2025	MOHCD	PASS (Hard Debt)-Series C	$650,000	Committed
			MOHCD	SSP (Soft Debt)	$2,950,000	Committed
SFCLT Scattered Sites - Pigeon Palace	6	5/31/2025	MOHCD	PASS (Hard Debt)-Series C	$810,811	Committed
			MOHCD	SSP (Soft Debt)	$2,496,642	Committed

Item 9

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)
Subject:	FW: DPH Sunshine Ordinance, 21G, 21B Reporting (updated)
Date:	Thursday, August 7, 2025 1:47:16 PM
Attachments:	Memo DPH FY24-25 Chapter 21G Report (BOS).pdf FY 24-25 Chapter 21G Grant Agreement Sole Source List.pdf Memo DPH FY24-25 Sunshine Ordinance List (BOS).pdf FY24-25 Chapter 67.24 Sunshine Ordinance Sole Source List.pdf Memo DPH FY24-25 Chapter 21B Core Initiatives Report (BOS).pdf FY24-25 Chapter 21B Core Initiatives List.pdf

---

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Department of Public Health, submitting the following:

1. Memo to Clerk of the BOS: Chapter 21G (File name: Memo DPH FY24-25 Chapter 21G Report (BOS))
a. Attachment: FY 24-25 Chapter 21G Grant Agreement Sole Source List
2. Memo to Clerk of the BOS: Sunshine Ordinance (File name: Memo DPH FY24-25 Sunshine Ordinance List (BOS))
a. Attachment: FY24-25 Chapter 67.24 Sunshine Ordinance Sole Source List (updated to include contracts under Admin Codes 21.42, 21A.4, and 1.25.)
3. Memo to Clerk of the BOS Chapter 21B Core Initiatives (File name: Memo DPH FY24-25 Chapter 21B Core Initiatives Report (BOS))
a. Attachment: FY24-25 Chapter 21B Core Initiatives List

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: Mach, Philip (DPH) <philip.mach@sfdph.org>
Sent: Thursday, August 7, 2025 1:00 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Cc: Tsai, Daniel (DPH) <daniel.tsai@sfdph.org>; Louie, Jenny (DPH) <jenny.louie@sfdph.org>; Baker, Kim (DPH) <kim.baker@sfdph.org>; Murrell, Drew (DPH) <drew.murrell@sfdph.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Altman, Claire (DPH) <claire.altman@sfdph.org>; Jones, Paula (DPH) <paula.jones@sfdph.org>; Bobba, Naveena (DPH) <naveena.bobba@sfdph.org>; Pojman, Natalie (DPH) <natalie.pojman@sfdph.org>; Ruggels, Michelle (DPH) <michelle.ruggels@sfdph.org>; Kirby, Valerie (DPH) <valerie.kirby@sfdph.org>
Subject: RE: DPH Sunshine Ordinance, 21G, 21B Reporting

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

For Item #2 listed below, the FY24-25 Chapter 67.24 Sunshine Ordinance Sole Source List has been updated to include contracts under Admin Codes 21.42, 21A.4, and 1.25.

I am re-attaching all the files for your convenience. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Phil

This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If Protected Health Information (PHI) is contained in this email, unauthorized disclosure may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws. If you received this email in error, notify me and destroy the email immediately.

From: Mach, Philip (DPH)
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2025 4:12 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Cc: Tsai, Daniel (DPH) <daniel.tsai@sfdph.org>; Louie, Jenny (DPH) <jenny.louie@sfdph.org>; Baker, Kim (DPH) <kim.baker@sfdph.org>; Murrell, Drew (DPH) <drew.murrell@sfdph.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Altman, Claire (DPH) <claire.altman@sfdph.org>; Jones, Paula (DPH) <Paula.Jones@sfdph.org>; Bobba, Naveena (DPH) <naveena.bobba@sfdph.org>; Pojman, Natalie (DPH) <natalie.pojman@sfdph.org>
Subject: DPH Sunshine Ordinance, 21G, 21B Reporting

Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Attached are the following documents:

1. Memo to Clerk of the BOS: Chapter 21G (File name: Memo DPH FY24-25 Chapter 21G Report (BOS))
    a. Attachment: FY 24-25 Chapter 21G Grant Agreement Sole Source List
2. Memo to Clerk of the BOS: Sunshine Ordinance (File name: Memo DPH FY24-25 Sunshine Ordinance List (BOS))
    a. Attachment: FY24-25 Chapter 67.24 Sunshine Ordinance Sole Source List
3. Memo to Clerk of the BOS Chapter 21B Core Initiatives (File name: Memo DPH FY24-25 Chapter 21B Core Initiatives Report (BOS))
    a. Attachment: FY24-25 Chapter 21B Core Initiatives List

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Philip Mach
Behavioral Health Services l Department of Public Health
Office of Contract Management & Compliance
1380 Howard Street, Room 421b
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.271.6212 l philip.mach@sfdph.org

This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If Protected Health Information (PHI) is contained in this email, unauthorized disclosure may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws. If you received this email in error, notify me and destroy the email immediately.

City and County of San Francisco
Daniel Lurie, Mayor

San Francisco Department of Public Health
Daniel Tsai
Director of Health

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: July 30, 2025

TO: Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

FROM: Michelle Ruggels, Director, DPH Business Office

RE: Annual FY24-25 DPH Sole Source Waiver Usage Report submitted to the Board of Supervisors

At the end of each fiscal year, in compliance with the San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 67.24 "Sunshine Ordinance," each City department must provide to the Board of Supervisors with a list of all professional sole source contracts (selected without a solicitation) entered into during the fiscal year. This report is aligned to the annual report prepared by the Office of Contract Administration (OCA).

Please find DPH's FY24-25 submission attached.

Please let me know if you need further information.

cc: Dan Tsai, DPH Director
Jenny Louie, DPH COO
Drew Murrell, DPH CFO
Kim Baker, Director of the Office of Contract Management and Compliance
Eileen McHugh, Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Claire Altman, Acting Government Affairs Manager

21.30(d) Proprietary Software License and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance

ServiceNow Number	Waiver Created Date	Department	Requester Name	Waiver Justification	New Waiver or Modification?	For Modifications Only: Last Approved OCA Waiver	Contract ID entered by Department	*Supplier Name (PeopleSoft)*	Contract NTE (PeopleSoft)	Start Date (PeopleSoft)	End Date (PeopleSoft)	Contract Description (PeopleSoft)
OCAWVR0010098	7/3/2024	DPH	Ron Rossi	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	modification_digital	OCAWVR0007669	1000017892	CONDUENT PUBLIC HEALTH S	$ 2,343,127	12/4/2019	12/3/2029	software maintenance for Cond
OCAWVR0010348	8/22/2024	DPH	Joanna Li	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	new		1000034406	IMPRIVATA INC	$ 3,184,321	12/31/2024	12/30/2027	Imprivata Software and Suppor
OCAWVR0010633	10/16/2024	DPH	Joanna Li	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	new		1000034506	HEALTHSTREAM INC	$ 1,196,760	4/1/2025	3/31/2030	Software Maintenance OneSta
OCAWVR0010797	11/18/2024	DPH	Kristina Martinez	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	new		1000033639	HS GOVTECH USA INC	$ 1,753,398	1/15/2025	1/14/2030	Environmental Health System
OCAWVR0010848	12/5/2024	DPH	Joanna Li	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	modification_digital	OCAWVR0010348	1000034406	IMPRIVATA INC	$ 3,184,321	12/31/2024	12/30/2027	Imprivata Software and Suppor
OCAWVR0010878	12/12/2024	DPH	Jose Cano	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	new		1000034470	WERFEN USA LLC	$ 175,000	4/30/2025	4/29/2030	Gemweb Software Maintenanc
OCAWVR0010908	12/18/2024	DPH	Ron Rossi	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	modification_digital	OCAWVR0004003	1000034340	Clinisys, Inc.	$ 195,600	1/1/2021	12/31/2026	Soft. maint. ApolloLIMS
OCAWVR0011067	1/23/2025	DPH	Ron Rossi	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	modification_digital	OCAWVR0010908	1000034340	Clinisys, Inc.	$ 195,600	1/1/2021	12/31/2026	Soft. maint. ApolloLIMS
OCAWVR0011078	1/27/2025	DPH	Ian Fernando	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	modification_digital	OCAWVR0010797	1000033639	HS GOVTECH USA INC	$ 1,753,398	1/15/2025	1/14/2030	Environmental Health System
OCAWVR0011178	2/11/2025	DPH	Ron Rossi	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	modification_digital	OCAWVR0010098	1000017892	CONDUENT PUBLIC HEALTH S	$ 2,343,127	12/4/2019	12/3/2029	software maintenance for Cond
OCAWVR0011718	5/13/2025	DPH	Jose Cano	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	modification_digital	OCAWVR0005484	1000008783	INTELLIGENT MEDICAL OBJECT	$ 710,871	3/31/2018	8/2/2025	DPH - License agreement

Proprietary Article 21.5(d) Prof Srvcs

ServiceNow Number	Waiver Created Date	Department	Requester Name	Waiver Justification	New Waiver or Modification?	For Modifications Only: Last Approved OCA Waiver	Contract ID entered by Department	*Supplier Name (PeopleSoft)*	Contract NTE (PeopleSoft)	Start Date (PeopleSoft)	End Date (PeopleSoft)	Contract Description (PeopleSoft)
OCAWVR0010167	7/18/2024	DPH	Connie Jozami	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new		1000033748	CorneaGen Inc.	$ 500,000	10/1/2024	9/30/2028	TC61446 DPH Cornea Tissue
OCAWVR0010353	8/23/2024	DPH	Nathaniel Wong	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	modification_digital	OCAWVR0009919	1000023814	CEPHEID	$ 405,388	5/1/2022	4/30/2029	GeneXpert Equip Maintenance
OCAWVR0010381	8/27/2024	DPH	Connie Jozami	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new		1000034068	SKELETAL DYNAMICS INC	$ 350,000	11/1/2024	10/31/2026	orthopedic surgical implants
OCAWVR0010410	9/3/2024	DPH	Connie Jozami	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	modification_digital	OCAWVR0008662	1000031056	SOURCE SURGICAL INC	$ 220,000	11/27/2023	12/31/2025	TC60760 DPH Hemedex Produc
OCAWVR0010420	9/3/2024	DPH	Connie Jozami	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new		1000034155	ARGON MEDICAL DEVICES INC	$ 250,000	2/10/2025	2/9/2027	Vascular, Biopsy & Guidewire
OCAWVR0010573	10/3/2024	DPH	Selina Ng	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new		1000033811	MEDTRONIC USA INC	$ 197,584	3/1/2025	2/28/2030	DPH - Eq Maint Midas Rex MR8
OCAWVR0010732	11/4/2024	DPH	Connie Jozami	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	modification_digital	OCAWVR0004205	1000022408	Q SURGICAL LLC	$ 2,000,000	8/1/2021	7/31/2030	TC61460 DPH Medical Supplies
OCAWVR0010893	12/14/2024	DPH	Julie Yu	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new		1000033967	NxStage Medical, Inc.	$ 2,800,000	4/1/2025	5/31/2030	TC60761 NxStage CRT Machine
OCAWVR0010972	1/3/2025	DPH	Selina Ng	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	modification_digital	OCAWVR0010573	1000033811	MEDTRONIC USA INC	$ 197,584	3/1/2025	2/28/2030	DPH - Eq Maint Midas Rex MR8
OCAWVR0011038	1/17/2025	DPH	Ky Thai	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	modification_digital	OCAWVR0009221	1000002882	SIEMENS INDUSTRY INC	$ 4,968,088	3/1/2017	2/28/2026	DPH.MAINTAIN EQUIP.SOFTWA
OCAWVR0011100	1/30/2025	DPH	Maggie Wu	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	modification_digital	OCAWVR0008990	1000031774	QIAGEN LLC	$ 222,078	1/31/2024	1/30/2032	Equipment Maintenance
OCAWVR0011176	2/11/2025	DPH	Maggie Wu	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	modification_digital	OCAWVR0010353	1000023814	CEPHEID	$ 405,388	5/1/2022	4/30/2029	GeneXpert Equip Maintenance
OCAWVR0011283	2/26/2025	DPH	Marco Diaz	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new	OCAWVR0011283	1000035450	Clear Labs, Inc.	$ 1,385,787	4/1/2025	3/31/20234	COVID Sequence Equipment M
OCAWVR0011772	5/23/2025	DPH	Maggie Wu	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	modification_digital	OCAWVR0006009	1000025253	CEPHEID	$ 466,136	6/30/2022	6/30/2027	DPH Reagent Rental

No Other Source or No Substitute 21.5(b)

ServiceNow Number	Waiver Created Date	Department	Requester Name	Waiver Justification	New Waiver or Modification?	For Modifications Only: Last Approved OCA Waiver	Contract ID entered by Department	*Supplier Name (PeopleSoft)*	Contract NTE (PeopleSoft)	Start Date (PeopleSoft)	End Date (PeopleSoft)	Contract Description (PeopleSoft)
OCAWVR0010311	8/19/2024	DPH	Connie Jozami	21.5(b): No Substitue for Project/Service and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	modification_digital	OCAWVR0009717	1000033467	MY01 US Inc	530000	10/7/2024	10/6/2029	TC70050 Monitors
OCAWVR0010421	9/3/2024	DPH	Connie Jozami	21.5(b): No Substitue for Project/Service and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new		1000034247	SAFEWAY INC	400000	10/30/2024	6/30/2025	DPH-CA, SAFEWAY GIFT CARDS
OCAWVR0010550	9/25/2024	DPH	Connie Jozami	21.5(b): No Substitue for Project/Service and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new		1000034247	SAFEWAY INC	400000	10/30/2024	6/30/2025	DPH-CA, SAFEWAY GIFT CARDS
OCAWVR0011048	1/21/2025	DPH	Lin (Sr. Admin Analyst) Qiu	21.5(b): No Substitue for Project/Service and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new		1000034194	ZERO TO THREE	25000	4/1/2025	3/31/2028	DPH Healthy Steps

Proprietary Articles 21.5(d) Commodities

ServiceNow Number	Waiver Created Date	Department	Requester Name	Waiver Justification	New Waiver or Modification?	Contract ID entered by Department	*Supplier Name (PeopleSoft)*	Contract NTE (PeopleSoft)	Start Date (PeopleSoft)	End Date (PeopleSoft)	Contract Description (PeopleSoft)
OCAWVR0010084	7/2/2024	DPH	David Lawlor	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new	1000033577	Innovative Product Achievemer	$ 76,704	8/1/2024	7/31/2028	TC88121 | OCA DPH ScrubEx V
OCAWVR0010089	7/2/2024	DPH	Kirby Tsai	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new	1000033587	Glaukos Corporation	$ 35,000	7/1/2024	6/30/2025	
OCAWVR0010144	7/16/2024	DPH	Kirby Tsai	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new	1000033719	Nu Technologies LLC	$ 75,000	7/1/2024	6/30/2025	FY 24-25 Annual Contract Nu-T
OCAWVR0010949	12/27/2024	DPH	Kirby Tsai	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new	1000035163	NEW WORLD MEDICAL INC	$ 100,000	7/1/2024	6/30/2025	FY24-25 Medical Supplies
OCAWVR0010951	12/30/2024	DPH	Kirby Tsai	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new	1000035082	CEPHEID	$ 1,000,000	1/27/2025	1/26/2030	TC61680 Reagents
OCAWVR0011327	3/6/2025	DPH	Kirby Tsai	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	modification_digital	1000027895	ShockWave Medical, Inc	$ 170,000	7/1/2024	6/30/2025	Annual Blanket Shockwave
OCAWVR0011334	3/7/2025	DPH	Kirby Tsai	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new	1000035516	ATOS MEDICAL INC	$ 6,000	1/1/2025	6/30/2027	Atos Medical contract FY25-26
OCAWVR0011435	3/24/2025	DPH	Kirby Tsai	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	modification_digital	1000033967	NxStage Medical, Inc.	$ 2,800,000	4/1/2025	5/31/2030	TC60761 NxStage CRT Machine
OCAWVR0011491	4/2/2025	DPH	Kirby Tsai	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	modification_digital	1000027895	ShockWave Medical, Inc	$ 170,000	7/1/2024	6/30/2025	Annual Blanket Shockwave
OCAWVR0011778	5/23/2025	DPH	Kirby Tsai	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	new	1000035863	Glaukos Corporation	$ 75,000	6/1/2025	6/30/2027	

Contract ID	Vendor Name	Program Name	Contract Status	Contract Start Date	Contract End Date	Purchasing Authority	NTE	Contracts Unit	Reason for 21.42
1000027852	APA Family Support Services	School-based Behavioral Health Program	Certified	8/19/2024	6/30/2028	21.42	$ 1,194,844	BHS	To align with expiration dates of other contracts for like services. This will allow for the soliciitation to be posted at the same time
1000032796	Baker Places new Community Hummingbird	Replaces 1000017071 - Hummingbird Valencia	Certified	7/1/2024	12/31/2026	21.42	$ 9,985,453	BHS	Was initially advised that the services would fall under the bed ordinance. Was later told it would not and needed a stop gap to allow time for solicitation.
1000032804	Community Youth Center San Francisco	ISCS/EPSDT Outpatient Program and Transitional Age Youth (TAY)	Certified	7/1/2024	6/30/2026	21.42	$ 1,279,447	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000027853	Curry Senior Center	Previous A-2 Behavioral Health Services in Primary Care (MHSA) new CID under 21.42. Delays in solicitation	Certified	7/1/2024	6/30/2026	21.42	$ 870,420	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000010030	Edgewood Center for Children and Families	Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Initiative (ECMHCI)	Certified	7/1/2018	6/30/2027	21.42	$ 57,298,967	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000028953	Edgewood Center for Children and Families	Wraparound (WRAP)	Certified	7/1/2023	6/30/2025	21.42	$ 3,170,116	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000009936	Felton Institute	MCAH-CHVP	Certified	7/1/2018	6/30/2027	21.42	$ 77,605,232	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000024190	Felton Institute	Peer to Peer (Felton/NAMI)	Certified	7/1/2021	12/31/2026	21.42	$ 2,998,782	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000033380	HealthRight 360	San Francisco Street Violence Intervention and Prevention (SFSVIP)	Certified	7/1/2024	6/30/2025	21.42	$ 5,481,721	BHS	Transitioned from NAMI (solicitation) to Felton. Was advised we could not cite solicitation and had to use 21.42
1000020107	Heluna Health	Behavioral Health Services Research Program (Formerly Street Crisis Response Team Evaluation SCRT)	Certified	12/15/2020	6/30/2025	21.42	$ 323,725	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000029573	Heluna Health	CARE Court	Certified	9/15/2023	6/30/2025	21.42	$ 513,335	BHS	Contract needed to be extended to allow for spend down
1000022465	Instituto Familiar de la Raza	ISCS/EPSDT Services La Cultura Cura and Family F.I.R.S.T.	Certified	7/1/2024	6/30/2026	21.42	$ 3,095,279	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000033422	RAMS (Richmond Area Multi Services, Inc.)	CAAP Counseling	Certified	7/1/2024	6/30/2025	21.42	$ 2,579,645	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000020708	RAMS (Richmond Area Multi Services, Inc.)	Whole Person Care - Shelter Care Coord Service	Certified	7/1/2021	6/30/2026	21.42	$ 29,116,181	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000023219	San Francisco Study Center Inc	Culturally Congruent and Innovative Practices for African American Communities	Certified	1/1/2024	12/31/2024	21.42	$ 688,298	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000028961	Seneca Family of Agencies	Long Term Connections – Wraparound Service	Certified	7/1/2023	6/30/2025	21.42	$ 9,990,000	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000024270	Shanti Lifelines (Jan/ 2025 contract at 101)	Margot Murphy Breast Cancer Program	Certified	1/1/2022	6/30/2025	21.42	$ 2,951,462	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000011339	The Salvation Army	Adult Probation Department (APD) Harbor Light Residential and Residential Detox Program	Certified	7/1/2018	6/30/2027	21.42	$ 7,518,010	BHS	To align with expiration dates of other contracts for like services. This will allow for the soliciitation to be posted at the same time
1000032060	The San Francisco AIDS Foundation	Naloxone Distribution & Overdose Prevention Education	Certified	7/1/2024	8/31/2028	21.42	$ 1,545,600	BHS	Named as subcontractor in grant application
1000029668	The San Francisco AIDS Foundation	Stonewall Project: Low Barrier Counseling	Certified	9/1/2023	2/28/2025	21.42	$ 3,427,200	BHS	Contract needed to be extended to allow for spend down
1000025074	UCSF Drug Surveilliance (Paul Wesson)	Surveillance of Injection and Non-Injection Drug Use (Paul Wesson)	Certified	6/1/2022	6/30/2026	21.42	$ 6,435,005	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000030266	Westside Community Mental Health Center	New contract for for Child and Adolescent Outpatient (under the same 21.42 authority), continued from CID 11455	Certified	1/1/2024	12/31/2027	21.42	$ 2,790,741	BHS	To align with expiration dates of other contracts for like services. This will allow for the soliciitation to be posted at the same time
1000033281	Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco	Intensive Supervision and Clinical Services (ISCS) Program	Certified	7/1/2024	6/30/2026	21.42	$ 1,060,122	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000010841	Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco	Oceanview, Merced Heights, Ingleside, (OMI) / Excelsior Beacon Center	Certified	7/1/2018	6/30/2027	21.42	$ 9,987,603	BHS	Allow time for solicitation
1000035255	Postive Resource Center	Benefits Couseling/Equal Access to HealthCare Program	Certified	3/1/2025	3/31/2027	21.42	$ 2,183,250	Non-BHS	Allow time for Solicitation
1000028935	Public Health Foundation Enterprises dba Heluna Health	National HIV Behavioral Surveillance	Certified	1/1/2024	12/31/2026	21.42	$ 3,944,643	Non-BHS	Allow time for Solicitation
1000030086	Public Health Foundation Enterprises dba Heluna Health	Public Health Ingrastructure Grant	Certified	9/15/2023	6/30/2028	21.42	$ 2,234,025	Non-BHS	Allow time for Solicitation
1000034343	SF Community Clinic Consortium	AmeriCorps Program Administrator	Open	10/1/2024	9/30/2025	21.42	$ 385,440.00	DOS	Vendor has been contracted since 2011, pending vendor payment, and will allow time to determine a long term solution

Contract ID	Vendor Name	Program Name	Contract Status	Contract Start Date	Contract End Date	Purchasing Authority	NTE	Contracts Unit
1000032810	Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco	1000003063 - New CID under G2G	Certified	1/1/2025	12/31/2030	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 3,199,605	BHS
1000026141	UCSF Bridge	Bridge - ED - NACCHO Grant	Certified	8/1/2022	6/30/2027	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 6,435,005	BHS
1000030385	UCSF CARE Court	UCSF CARE Court	Certified	5/1/2024	6/30/2026	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 5,233,796	BHS
1000032062	UCSF CTRP	Child Trauma Research Project	certified	7/1/2024	6/30/2029	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 1,679,591	BHS
1000032063	UCSF DBTC	Dialectical Behavior Therapy Clinic	Certified	7/1/2024	6/30/2029	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 249,534	BHS
1000029051	UCSF ICM Expansion	Behavioral Health Intensive Case Management Services	Certified	11/1/2023	6/30/2027	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 6,024,004	BHS
1000029474	UCSF	Vouchers for Veggies - Eat SF	Certified	8/1/2023	6/30/2033	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 5,872,400	Non-BHS
1000028007	UCSF	Vouchers for Veggies - Eat SF	Certified	7/1/2023	6/30/2026	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 3,902,000	Non-BHS
1000008731	UCSF School of Dentistry	Local Oral Health	Certified	1/1/2018	6/30/2027	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 867,116	Non-BHS
1000012685	UCSF - Pediatric	Pediatric Immunology HIV/AIDS Program	Certified	3/1/2019	2/28/2027	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 1,192,608	Non-BHS
1000028521	UCSF Ward 86	HIV Services Ward 86	Certified	7/1/2023	6/30/2028	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 8,172,602	Non-BHS
1000008725	UCSF 360 Wellness Center	HIV Psychosocial Support Groups	Certified	7/1/2018	6/30/2028	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 1,034,538	Non-BHS
1000024737	UCSF	Health Access Point: API	Certified	1/1/2023	6/30/2028	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 3,340,834	Non-BHS
1000024736	UCSF	Health Access Point: PWUD	Certified	1/1/2023	6/30/2026	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 4,070,804	Non-BHS
1000032157	UCSF	Integrated HIV Prevention Services	Certified	7/1/2024	6/30/2028	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 8,387,577	Non-BHS
1000028061	UCSF Team Lily	STD Prevention / STI Local Assistance Program / Syphilis Outbreak Strategy	Certified	7/1/2023	6/30/2027	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 708,480	Non-BHS
1000032802	City College of San Francisco	Addiction & Recovery Counseling	Certified	1/1/2025	12/31/2029	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 1,835,568	BHS
1000034865	UCSF	CAS Heluna Health	Certified	9/26/2024	6/30/2026	1.25(d) - G2G Legislation	$ 1,380,075	BHS

Contract ID	Vendor Name	Program Name	Contract Status	Contract Start Date	Contract End Date	Purchasing Authority	NTE	Contracts Unit
1000032999	A&A Health Services LLC	Rehabilitative Board & Care Residential Services	Certified	7/1/2024	6/30/2026	21A.4 - Bed Ordinance	$ 9,932,675	BHS
1000032801	Bayview Hunters Point Foundation for Community Improvement	1000011308 A-5 - Jelani - Replacement contract	Certified	7/1/2024	6/30/2029	21A.4 - Bed Ordinance	$ 4,018,743	BHS
1000032803	Community Forward SF (formerly CATS)	Managed Alcohol Program (MAP)	Certified	7/1/2024	12/31/2025	21A.4 - Bed Ordinance	$ 9,998,919	BHS
1000032807	HealthRight 360	1000027495 - New CID under bed ordinance or 21.42	Certified	7/1/2024	6/30/2026	21A.4 - Bed Ordinance	$ 9,965,347	BHS
1000032806	HealthRight 360	Drug Sobering Center previous CID 1000017171	Certified	7/1/2024	6/30/2026	21A.4 - Bed Ordinance	$ 8,657,844	BHS
1000032402	The Gubbio Project	Mission Safe-Sleeping Site	Certified	7/15/2024	6/30/2026	21A.4 - Bed Ordinance	$ 4,200,000	BHS
1000034052	Chinese Hospital Association	Subacute Skilled Nursing and Surge Support for Skilled Nursing facilities beds	Certified	12/1/2024	6/30/2025	21A.4 - Bed Ordinance	$ 5,379,976	DOS
1000034423	Five Keys Schools and Programs	Residential Beds	Certified	11/15/2024	6/30/2027	21A.4 - Bed Ordinance	$ 4,455,851	BHS
1000035747	Westside Community Mental Health Center	Kean Stabilization Center	Certified	6/2/2025	6/30/2026	21B and 21A.4	$ 7,774,934	BHS
1000034099	Bayview Hunters Point Multipurpose Senior Services, INC.	BHBH Transitional Housing	Certified	10/1/2024	6/30/2027	21A.4 - Bed Ordinance	$ 650,150	BHS
1000032350	Progress Foundation	Enhanced Dual Diagnosis Residential Treatment	Open	6/1/2025	12/31/2027	21A.4 - Bed Ordinance	$ -	BHS
1000035740	The Salvation Army	Recovery Housing SUD - Marina Transitional Residential Recovery	Certified	6/1/2025	6/30/2027	21B and 21A.4	$ 7,987,627	BHS

City and County of San Francisco
Daniel Lurie, Mayor

San Francisco Department of Public Health
Daniel Tsai
Director of Health

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: July 30, 2025

TO: Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

FROM: Michelle Ruggels, Director, DPH Business Office

RE: Annual FY24-25 San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 21G Sole Source Grant Agreement List

Effective June 2023, in compliance with San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 21G, each City department must provide to the Board of Supervisors a listing of each grant (contractual agreement) that the Granting Agency (DPH) awarded during the preceding calendar year without following an open and competitive process, identifying the exception relied on for making each such grant agreement without a process and a description of services.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

cc: Dan Tsai, DPH Director
Jenny Louie, DPH COO
Naveen Bobba, DPH Deputy Director
Natalie Pojman, Chief of Staff, Office of the Director
Kim Baker, Director of the Office of Contract Management and Compliance
Eileen McHugh, Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Claire Altman, Acting Government Affairs Manager

Michelle.Ruggels@sfdph.org – 1145 Market Street, 10th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103 – (628) 271-7549

FY 24-25 Chapter 21G Grant Agreement Sole Source List

Contract ID	Vendor Name	Program Name	Contract Status	Contract Start Date	Contract End Date	Purchasing Authority	NTE	Contracts Unit
1000024880	3rd Street Youth Center & Clinic	Mental Health Student Services Act	Certified	1/1/2022	9/30/2025	21G.8 Sole Source	$ 1,711,504	BHS
1000028562	Asian & Pacific Islander Wellness	Night Navigators	Certified	8/1/2023	7/31/2025	21G.8 Sole Source	$ 1,685,183	BHS
1000027339	Felton Institute	STARR (Supporting Treatment and Reducing Recidivism)	Certified	2/16/2023	3/1/2026	21G.3(a)(2)	$ 1,952,788	BHS
1000028423	Horizons Unlimited of San Francisco	Prevention Education	Certified	7/1/2023	6/30/2025	21G.8 Sole Source	$ 1,891,327	BHS
1000028580	Jamestown Community Center	SUD Prevention	Certified	7/1/2023	6/30/2025	21G.8 Sole Source	$ 1,232,421	BHS
1000028533	Japanese Comm. Youth Council (JCYC)	Asian Youth Prevention Services	Certified	7/1/2023	6/30/2025	21G.8 Sole Source	$ 1,795,798	BHS
1000027656	The Salvation Army	Supporting Treatment and Reducing Recidivism (STARR)	Certified	2/16/2023	3/1/2026	21G.3(a)(2)	$ 4,194,288	BHS
1000028579	Youth Leadership Institute	SUD Prevention Services	Certified	7/1/2023	6/30/2025	21G.8 Sole Source	$ 1,229,059	BHS

City and County of San Francisco
Daniel Lurie, Mayor

San Francisco Department of Public Health
Daniel Tsai
Director of Health

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: July 30, 2025

TO: Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

FROM: Michelle Ruggels, Director, DPH Business Office

RE: Annual FY24-25 San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 21B Core Initiatives Contract Reports

Effective April 2025, each City department must provide to the Board of Supervisors a report for each contract or lease that the Granting Agency (DPH) executed during the prior fiscal quarter under San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 21B. Attached please find DPH's Quarterly Report(s).

Please let me know if you have any questions.

cc: Dan Tsai, DPH Director
Jenny Louie, DPH COO
Naveen Bobba, DPH Deputy Director
Natalie Pojman, Chief of Staff, Office of the Director
Kim Baker, Director of the Office of Contract Management and Compliance
Eileen McHugh, Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Claire Altman, Acting Government Affairs Manager

Michelle.Ruggels@sfdph.org – 1145 Market Street, 10th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103 – (628) 271-7549

Contract ID	Vendor Name	Program Name	Contract Status	Contract Start Date	Contract End Date	Purchasing Authority	NTE	Contracts Unit
1000035747	Westside Community Mental Health Center	Kean Stabilization Center	Certified	6/2/2025	6/30/2026	21B and 21A.4	$ 7,774,934	BHS
1000035740	The Salvation Army	Recovery Housing SUD - Marina Transitional Residential Recovery	Certified	6/1/2025	6/30/2027	21B and 21A.4	$ 7,987,627	BHS
1000035783	Westside Community Mental Health Center	SUD Clubhouse	Open	3/15/2025	6/30/2026	21B - Core Initiative	$ 592,480	BHS

City and County of San Francisco
Daniel Lurie, Mayor

San Francisco Department of Public Health

Daniel Tsai
Director of Health

Reporting Period (agreements executed between): 4/1/2025 and 6/30/2025

Contracts, Requisitions, and Purchase Orders (POs)

Agreement Type: Contract	**Contract/PO/Req PeopleSoft ID#**: 1000035740
Supplier Name: The Salvation Army	**Supplier ID**: 0000009616
Contract Start Date: 6/1/2025	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2027 **Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $7,987,627

Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:

- ☐ Homelessness
- ☒ Mental Health Needs
- ☐ Integrated Health Needs
- ☒ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders
- ☐ Public Safety Hiring

Services provided under the contract during reporting period: The Marina Transitional Living Program will provide up to two years of drug free transitional housing and peer recovery support for individuals recovering from substance use disorders at 3110 Octavia Street. The facility will accommodate up to 68 participants and focus on fostering independence and long-term recovery

Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Measurable outcomes related to the contract during the reporting period are posted to sf.gov/cdta in the section under Performance Objectives/BHS

Leases

Agreement Type: Lease	**City-as-tenant or City-as-landlord?** Select here
New Lease or Amendment: Select here	**Contracting Party Name**: Enter supplier name
Funds conveyed or received to date: Enter amount	**Contracting Party ID**: Enter 10-digit ID
Lease Start Date: Select date	**Lease End Date**: Select date

Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:

- ☐ Homelessness
- ☐ Mental Health Needs
- ☐ Integrated Health Needs
- ☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders
- ☐ Public Safety Hiring

Services provided under lease during reporting period: Provide details about the scope of work for lease

Measurable outcomes related to lease during reporting period: Provide details about outcomes resulting from lease

City and County of San Francisco
Daniel Lurie, Mayor

San Francisco Department of Public Health

Daniel Tsai
Director of Health

Reporting Period (agreements executed between): 4/1/2025 and 6/30/2025

Contracts, Requisitions, and Purchase Orders (POs)

Agreement Type: Contract	**Contract/PO/Req PeopleSoft ID#**: 1000035747
Supplier Name: Westside Community Mental Health Center	**Supplier ID**: 0000008254
Contract Start Date: 6/2/2025	**Contract End Date**: 7/30/2026 **Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $7,774,934
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:	
☒ Homelessness ☒ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs	☒ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: The Eleanora Fagan Center will provide short-term respite beds plus health stabilization with a capacity of 76 participants. The shelter is located at 1018 Mission Street, SF, CA 94103, for adults experiencing homelessness in San Francisco with primary and/or behavioral health challenges.	
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Measurable outcomes related to the contract during the reporting period are posted to sf.gov/cdta in the section under Performance Objectives/BHS	

Leases

Agreement Type: Lease	**City-as-tenant or City-as-landlord?** Select here
New Lease or Amendment: Select here	**Contracting Party Name**: Enter supplier name
Funds conveyed or received to date: Enter amount	**Contracting Party ID**: Enter 10-digit ID
Lease Start Date: Select date	**Lease End Date**: Select date
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:	
☐ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs	☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under lease during reporting period: Provide details about the scope of work for lease	
Measurable outcomes related to lease during reporting period: Provide details about outcomes resulting from lease	

City and County of San Francisco
Daniel Lurie, Mayor

San Francisco Department of Public Health
Daniel Tsai
Director of Health

Reporting Period (agreements executed between): 4/1/2025 and 6/30/2025

Contracts, Requisitions, and Purchase Orders (POs)

Agreement Type: Contract	**Contract/PO/Req PeopleSoft ID#**: 1000035783
Supplier Name: Westside Community Mental Health Center	**Supplier ID**: 0000008254
Contract Start Date: 3/15/2025	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2026 **Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $592,480

Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:

☐ Homelessness	☒ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders
☒ Mental Health Needs	☐ Public Safety Hiring
☐ Integrated Health Needs	

Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Expansion of a Clubhouse to serve individuals living with serious mental illness and substance use disorders through ancillary case management. Goal is to minimize social isolation and empower individuals with Substance Use Disorders to pursue new opportunities with confidence. The Clubhouse strives to provide a supportive environment where members can form meaningful social connections and take on responsibilities that enhance their sense of purpose. The program aims to minimize social isolation for clients in Methadone/ Buprenorphine treatment by fostering peer-to-peer support networks and promoting recovery.

Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Measurable outcomes related to the contract during the reporting period are posted to sf.gov/cdta in the section under Performance Objectives/BHS

Leases

Agreement Type: Lease	**City-as-tenant or City-as-landlord?** Select here
New Lease or Amendment: Select here	**Contracting Party Name**: Enter supplier name
Funds conveyed or received to date: Enter amount	**Contracting Party ID**: Enter 10-digit ID
Lease Start Date: Select date	**Lease End Date**: Select date

Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:

☐ Homelessness	☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders
☐ Mental Health Needs	☐ Public Safety Hiring
☐ Integrated Health Needs	

Services provided under lease during reporting period: Provide details about the scope of work for lease

Measurable outcomes related to lease during reporting period: Provide details about outcomes resulting from lease

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: *UPDATED Meeting Dates – August 2025 Arts Commission Public Meetings
Date:	Friday, August 1, 2025 11:14:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from the San Francisco Arts Commission, submitting dates for August 2025 public meetings.

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: San Francisco Arts Commission <art-info@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2025 12:32 PM
To: Adkins, Joe (BOS) <joe.adkins@sfgov.org>
Subject: *UPDATED Meeting Dates – August 2025 Arts Commission Public Meetings

August 2025 Public Meetings

- ~~Full Commission~~
- Civic Design Review Committee
- Visual Arts Committee
- Community Investments Committee
- Executive Committee
- View as Webpage

Upcoming Public Meetings

Meeting details and agenda information can be found on the Arts Commission Meeting page on sf.gov.



Images: Full Commission Meeting, City Hall, Room 416 - July 7, 2025

The San Francisco Arts Commission is committed to open government. Any member of the public is welcome to attend our meetings and provide public comment.

The meeting agenda, access link, and instructions for providing public comment will be posted on the sf.gov Arts Commission Meeting page at least 72 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting. (Sec. 67.7.)

San Francisco Arts Commission Full Commission Meeting: CANCELLED

Full Commission meetings are generally held on the first Monday each month at 2:00 PM and generally last for about two hours. If the scheduled date falls on a holiday, the meeting will usually be rescheduled to the following or preceding week.

Civic Design Review Committee Meeting: August 18, 2025*

Civic Design Review Committee meetings are generally held on the third Monday of each month at 2:00 PM, and generally last for about three hours. If the scheduled date falls on a holiday, the meeting will usually be rescheduled to the following or preceding week.

This will be an in-person meeting held at **City Hall, Room 416** and streamed online. via SFGovTV. This meeting will be broadcast live on SFGovTV2, accessible on Comcast channel 78 / Astound channel 28 / AT&T Uverse channel 99.

Visual Arts Committee Meeting: August 20, 2025*

Visual Arts Committee meetings are generally held on the third Wednesday of each month at 2:00 PM, and generally last for about two hours. If the scheduled date falls on a holiday, the meeting will usually be rescheduled to the following or preceding week.

This will be an in-person meeting held at **City Hall, Room 416** and streamed online via SFGovTV. This meeting will be broadcast live on SFGovTV2, accessible on Comcast channel 78 / Astound channel 28 / AT&T Uverse channel 99.

Community Investments Committee Meeting: August 26, 2025*

Community Investments Committee meetings are generally held on the third Tuesday on even-numbered months at 1:00 PM, and generally last for about two hours. If the scheduled date falls on a holiday, the meeting will usually be rescheduled to the following or preceding week.

This will be an in-person meeting held at **City Hall, Room 416** and streamed online. via SFGovTV. This meeting will be broadcast live on SFGovTV2, accessible on Comcast channel 78 / Astound channel 28 / AT&T Uverse channel 99.

Executive Committee Meeting: August 27, 2025*

Executive Committee meetings are generally held on the fourth Wednesday of each month at 1:00 PM, and generally last for about two hours. If the scheduled date falls on a holiday, the meeting will usually be rescheduled to the following or preceding week.

This will be an in-person meeting held at **City Hall, Room 408** and streamed online via SFGovTV. This meeting will be broadcast live on SFGovTV2, accessible on Comcast channel 78 / Astound channel 28 / AT&T Uverse channel 99.

---

*Meetings are subject to cancellation, which will be reflected on the sf.gov Arts Commission Meetings page and Arts Commission website event calendar.

Notice Regarding Remote Public Comment:

Public comments are accepted in person at all San Francisco Arts Commission public meetings. Remote public comment is available for those who require an ADA accommodation. Please reach out to art-info@sfgov.org or by calling 415-252-2247 with any questions or to make an accommodation request. We request at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting, pursuant to Administrative Code Section 97.7. Late requests will be honored if possible. For meetings scheduled on Mondays, please submit requests by 4:00 p.m. the previous Friday.

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.

Persons unable to attend an Arts Commission meeting may submit correspondence to the Arts Commission in connection with an agenda item. Arts Commission staff 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 meetings should be submitted to art-info@sfgov.org by 5:00 p.m. before the date of the meeting to ensure comments are shared with commissioners ahead of the meeting.

ACCESSIBILITY

Per the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Language Access Ordinance, Chinese, Spanish, and/or American Sign Language interpreters will be available upon request. Please submit your request to art-info@sfgov.org at least 2 days (48 hours) prior to the scheduled meeting. For Monday meetings, please submit your request by 4 p.m. the Friday before. 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.

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。

POLITICA DE ACCESO A LA REUNIÓN

De acuerdo con la Ley sobre Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (Americans with 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.

PATAKARAN PARA SA PAG-ACCESS NG MGA MITING

Ayon sa batas ng Americans with 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.

MEETING ARCHIVE

Meeting Agendas, Minutes and Recordings prior to June 2022 are archived and available on the archived sfgov.org Arts Commission website. Meeting Agendas, Minutes and Recordings from January 2022 onwards are now posted here on sf.gov/artscommission. Click the "See past meetings" button on the meeting page to access past meeting documents.

San Francisco Arts Commission | 401 Van Ness Ave Suite 325 | San Francisco, CA 94102 US

Unsubscribe | Update Profile | Constant Contact Data Notice

Constant Contact

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); Entezari, Mehran (BOS)
Subject:	FW: SFPD Required Report - Chapter 96a, Law Enforcement Reporting
Date:	Friday, August 1, 2025 3:00:00 PM
Attachments:	Victim Demographic Report Q1 2025.pdf Q12025 Signed Cover Letter.pdf QADR Q1 2025_Final.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached Law Enforcement Reports from the SFPD.

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: Cunningham, Jason (POL) <jason.cunningham@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2025 10:27 AM
To: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@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>; Aroche, Diana (POL) <diana.aroche@sfgov.org>; Fountain, Chris (POL) <Christine.Fountain@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: SFPD Required Report - Chapter 96a, Law Enforcement Reporting

Good morning Madam Clerk,

On behalf of Interim Chief Paul Yep, the attached reports for Quarter 1 2025 are being submitted pursuant to Admin Code Chapter 96A, Law Enforcement Reporting. Your assistance is appreciated in the distribution to the members of the Board.

Thank you for your assistance.

v/r

Jason Cunningham
Program Manager
Professional Standards & Principled Policing Unit
San Francisco Police Department

jason.cunningham@sfgov.org
(415) 889-0024 (C)

Book time on my calendar

DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

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

PAUL Y. YEP
INTERIM CHIEF OF POLICE

July 16th, 2025

The Honorable Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

The Honorable Rafael Mandelman
President, Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

The Honorable C. Don Clay
President, Police Commission
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

Acting Director Mawuli Tugbenyoh
Executive Director, Human Rights Commission
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisor Mandelman, Commissioner Clay, and Acting Director Tugbenyoh:

RE: First Quarter 2025 Report per Chapter 96A, Law Enforcement Reporting Requirements – Stops Data, Use of Force, Crime Victim, and Domestic Violence

As required by Administrative Code Chapter 96A, the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) is submitting the attached Quarterly Activity and Data Report (QADR). The report is being submitted past the required date (1st Tuesday in May) due to the increased complexity of the reporting requirements.

SFPD is transitioning its Quarterly Activity and Data Report into a series of online dashboards. These dashboards will be rolled out in phases, by data set, starting with Stops data. These dashboards will replace a large section of the "paper" QADR with explorable data, updated quarterly, in tandem with data prepared for submission to California Department of Justice. The Stop Dashboards are located here: (SFPD Stop Data Dashboards | San Francisco Police Department).

Additionally, this Quarterly report expands on our traditional single metric used to measure disparity. The additional benchmarks are the Risk Adjusted Disparity (RAD) index, Suspect Adjusted Disparity (SAD) index and Not-at-fault crash Traffic Analytic Layout (TAL) index. They each utilize different measures to provide additional context and an additional benchmark with which to understand with whom the department interacts. The analyses enhance public understanding of police enforcement activities and increase reporting transparency.

We appreciate the commitment the Mayor and Board of Supervisors has expressed toward the reform initiatives being implemented by the SFPD. We believe these efforts are in alignment with the values of our department and create a closer step to re-envisioning policing to better serve all our communities.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or my staff, Director of Policy and Public Affairs, Diana Aroche at diana.aroche@sfgov.org. These documents will be posted online at www.sanfranciscopolice.org.

Sincerely,

PAUL Y. YEP
Interim Chief of Police

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

Quarterly Activity and Data Report
Quarter 1 2025

Safety with Respect

William Scott,
Chief of Police
San Francisco
Police Department

Table of Contents

Introduction 3
Benchmarking Stop Data 3
Census Population Benchmarking 4
Census Population Benchmark Advantages 4
Census Population Benchmark Disadvantages 4
Including Three Additional Benchmarks 5
Risk Adjusted Disparity Index 8
Suspect Adjusted Disparity Index 12
Not at Fault Crash Traffic Analytic Layout 15
CRSTAL Conclusions 17
CRSTAL Methodologies 19
Risk Adjusted Disparity Index 19
Suspect Adjusted Disparity Index 21
Not at Fault Crash Traffic Analytic Layout 21
Use of Force Data Update 24
Stops Data Collection Transition & Associated Errors 27
Quarterly Activity and Data Report 31
2025 Q1 Overview 32
Suspects 33
Stops and Searches 36
Use of Force 37
Arrests 42
Bias-Related Complaints 44
Domestic Violence Reporting - Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b 46
SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report – Additional Data Tables 48
Calls for Service, Q1 2025 50
Suspects, Q1 2025 51

Use of Force, Q1 2025 54
Arrests, Q1 2025 69
By District Data 71
Central District 75
Southern District 78
Bayview District 81
Mission District 84
Northern District 87
Park District 90
Richmond District 93
Ingleside District 96
Taraval District 99
Tenderloin District 102
Airport 105
Outside of SF/Unknown 108
Glossary 112

Introduction

SFPD is transitioning its Quarterly Activity and Data Report to a series of online dashboards. These dashboards will be rolled out in phases, by data set, starting with Stops data, commencing with the Q1 2025 QADR. As each type of police action is added to the online dashboard site, SFPD will remove the descriptive statistical elements of that police action data set and announce the move on the SFPD QADR landing site. Where it does not already provide them, SFPD will also be adding these data sets to DataSF.

SFPD will continue to provide benchmarking and other special analyses in the QADR. However, SFPD is sunsetting the series of metrics that use a "Per Capita" benchmarking approach. SFPD is adding three other types of metrics to the population comparison metric. These additional metrics are expected to factor in more of the context of what problems officers are trying to solve and what direction they've been provided to solve them.

Benchmarking Stop Data

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), in line with its dedication to transparency, provides descriptive statistics about enforcement and search patterns and trends. To provide a simple contextual setting for the reader, previous Quarterly Activity and Data Reports (QADRs) have compared the demographics of the general residential population with individuals subject to a police stop or other action. However, the many dissimilarities between the group of people who may experience police action and the group who comprise the San Francisco residential population means that this comparison provides only partial information at best.

To provide more insight, the Department is broadening the types of benchmarks it employs for stop and search data analysis. The QADR will now include a total of four (4) types of benchmark analyses to enhance public understanding of police contact with the public. It's important to note that there is no universally agreed upon optimal benchmark, as each benchmark comes with its own set of advantages and disadvantages. Smith, Tillyer, Lloyd and Petrocelli describe benchmarking as an "imperfect science" (2021).

Neil and Winship assert that "benchmarking oversimplifies stop and search data to the point where it should not be used as a metric[1]" (2019). Despite this assertion, the

[1] Methodological Challenges and Opportunities in Testing for Racial Discrimination in Policing | Annual Reviews

Department has a responsibility to provide these data, as well as their context, in a manner that allows the public to better understand the actions of the Department. More recent scholarship on benchmarking was published in 2025 by Ratcliffe and Hyland that also discusses in depth the challenges of benchmarking[2].

Each of the new benchmarking types are described below, including the advantages and disadvantages of each. The descriptions also provide the underlying assumptions, any accompanying methodological adjustments, and the results of the analysis required to calculate the benchmark.

Census Population Benchmarking

The SFPD has consolidated and moved its census benchmarking analysis to a web-based dashboard, located on the SFPD website: SFPD Stop Data Dashboards[3].

By moving the analysis to a live dashboard and publishing online, the department hopes to increase access to this high-level contextual information.

Census Population Benchmark Advantages

A key benefit in using a population data benchmark is the intuitive ease of understanding as compared to other benchmarks. Other benchmarking techniques can utilize univariate or multivariate statistical analysis that can be hard to explain succinctly and can quickly become overwhelming. This benchmark can provide an easy to comprehend, high level datapoint when considering disparities in police contacts.

Census Population Benchmark Disadvantages

Although population data is easy to obtain and use, and the resulting benchmarked metrics are clear and easily understood, as noted by Smith et al., in "nearly every other regard… [it] fails as a benchmark" (2021). The California Department of Justice, in their Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) 2021 report, stated that "An assumption of this type of comparison is that the distribution of who is stopped would be similar to who resides within a comparable geographic region.[4]" However, officers do not encounter individuals at the same rates as found in the census and to conduct a stop, the circumstances and/or behavior must warrant it.

[2] Police stops and naïve denominators
[3] https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/sfpd-stop-data-dashboards
[4] 2021 RIPA Board Report - Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory (RIPA) Board (ca.gov)Pp46

Additionally, other differences in the data sets further complicate any comparability between them. For instance, the requirements and/or method for recording characteristics vary between data sets. The method for collecting demographic characteristics in the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) is self-reported, where the California Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) stops data is *officer perceived.* The choices within a characteristic also vary between data sets. For instance, for individuals of Polynesian descent, census data offers Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, whereas RIPA stops data offers Pacific Islander or Asian and SFPD data systems only offer Asian as a collected datapoint.

Further, "Population counts generally overestimate bias in stop decisions, as differences in poverty, education, and labor market opportunities vary across identity groups in the U.S. Because education and employment affect criminal behavior, disparities along these dimensions will lead to disparities in who commits crime. In this way, pre-existing social disparities will tend to make the fraction of Black or Latinx people in the population smaller than the fraction of Black or Latinx people who are potentially subject to being stopped, overestimating any bias in a stop decision[5]" (Owens & Rosenquist). These limitations should be kept in mind when interpreting results of any population benchmark.

For further reading, a deeper analysis of the challenges around per capita population benchmarking is discussed in the 2019 paper "Methodological Challenges and Opportunities in Testing for Racial Discrimination in Policing[6]" by Roland Neil and Christopher Winship.

Including Three Additional Benchmarks

Given the challenges that Census benchmarking presents, and that there are no perfect metrics or comparison populations to use, SFPD is adding three benchmarks to its regular reporting. The additional benchmarks are the Risk Adjusted Disparity (RAD) index, Suspect Adjusted Disparity (SAD) index and Not-at-fault crash Traffic Analytic Layout (TAL) index. They each utilize different measures to provide additional context and an additional benchmark with which to understand with whom the department interacts.

[5] https://www.capolicylab.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/RIPA-in-the-LAPD-Summary-Report.pdf pp12-13[6] Methodological Challenges and Opportunities in Testing for Racial Discrimination in Policing | Annual Reviews

[6] Methodological Challenges and Opportunities in Testing for Racial Discrimination in Policing | Annual Reviews

Each benchmark uses data from the last six quarters (18 months). This will provide a near-term historical analysis, and the results show trends over time, per demographic group. For an in-depth explanation of methodologies, see the methodology section below.

Each benchmarking methodology comes with specific strengths and weaknesses, some of which are noted below in **Table 1**:

Table 1: Advantage and Disadvantage of Different Benchmarking Strategies

	Advantage	Disadvantage
Population Benchmark Uses the demographic makeup of the population in Census data to compare whether there is a similar makeup in population of individuals stopped by Police.	• Simple to conduct • Easy to explain for all residents	• Difficult to accurately estimate due to unequal racial resident population • Does not include relevant control variables to explain differences[7] • Stop location can differ from residence location • Relies on census information which may be outdated/underrepresented
RAD Index Uses the demographic makeup of violent crime victims. Compares this to the demographic makeup of the population of individuals stopped by Police	• Creates an easy ratio to compare across racial categories • Relies on victim demographics which are consistently captured • Reflects motivators of officer behavior – addressing crime	• Assumes victim/perpetrator are the same race • Assumes equivalency in incident reporting across racial groups • Assumes all stops are in furtherance of addressing violent crime

[7] For instance, a population benchmark used in stop data assumes the full residential population including infants or immobile community members would be open to police interaction, when that is not the case.

	generally, and addressing crime for those most at risk of being victimized.	
SAD Index Uses the demographic makeup of violent crime suspects. Compares this to the demographic makeup of the population of individuals stopped by Police	• Relies on suspect information which narrows population of those contacted by police • More directly approaches RAD index intent while avoiding homogeneity challenges	• Numerator includes all stops regardless if the stop was the 'right' individual • May not account for repeat offenders • Inconsistent racial identifiers for suspects • Assumes all stops are made in response to the suspect descriptions of violent crime • May insert a level of human bias by the reporting and/or investigating parties
TAL Index Uses the demographic makeup of drivers in serious collisions who are deemed not at fault. Compares this to the same demographic population of individuals stopped by Police	• Creates a metric closer to the true driving population than census data • Relies on data from officer interaction during a traffic crash with crash injuries, a random occurrence • Simple interpretation of results	• Specific locations may be more prone to traffic crashes. • Small data set because traffic crashes reported are only those resulting in injury or complaint of pain. • Only measures stops of vehicles, and excludes pedestrian stops.

Risk Adjusted Disparity Index

The Risk Adjusted Disparity (RAD) Index was introduced by Lawrence Sherman and Sumit Kumar in 2021 as a methodology to address the flaws in traditional police interaction disparity measures (e.g. population benchmarking). Instead of considering the whole population in the analysis, the RAD focuses on victims of violent crime. Isolating the scope of police interaction to victims of violent crime allows comparisons to be contextualized within a group of the population that has documented contact with the police. This victim focused approach is consistent with SFPD values of protection of life being the highest priority and vigorous pursuit of those who commit serious crimes.

Utilizing the RAD index provides a new viewpoint from which to observe, measure, and report on potential disparities. It also provides additional context and the opportunity to monitor more than a single benchmark over time to observe trends. However, it is possible the count of victims of crime may be skewed due to historical understanding of different reasons people may avoid contact with the police after being victimized by a crime. We are aware that this measure is imperfect, but it can be used as an additional viewpoint.

The RAD index, a ratio of ratios, is a way to compare the treatment of different demographic groups across a population using victims as the denominator. Here, the RAD index compares the number of victims of violent crime against the number of stops per racial demographic group and compares that ratio for a racial group of interest against the ratio for the racial group baseline (e.g. White). In this analysis, Black/African American and Hispanic/Latine victims of violent crime are the groups of interest and those are compared to white victims of violent crime. Any violent crime with more than 20 people listed within an incident has been excluded as significantly different (e.g. mass arrest).

Equation 1: Example RAD Index Calculation

$$RAD\ Index_{Black} = \frac{Stops_{Black}/Victims_{Black}}{Stops_{White}/Victims_{White}}$$

A key assumption in the RAD index is that victims and suspects of violent crime share the same racial demographic group, as has been observed by the National Research Council[8].

8 National Research Council. 1993. Understanding and Preventing Violence: Volume 1. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/1861

The ratios that make up the RAD index, therefore, compare the rate of enforcement activity, based on the risk of a particular demographic group being victims (and also suspects) of violent crime. If officers are taking enforcement activity based on suspect descriptions, there should be similar levels of enforcement-to-victimization rates.

In practice, the assumption that victims and suspects share demographic groups varies from city to city and between demographic groups within those cities. As part of this analysis, violent crime homogeneity was analyzed to understand how victim and suspect align across demographic groups within the City of San Francisco. The results of this analysis are shown in **Figure 1** below and indicate that the victim/suspect homogeneity differs significantly across racial/ethnic groups.



Figure 1: San Francisco, CA Victim/Suspect Homogeneity Analysis

Figure 2 shows the RAD index for Black/African American individuals in San Francisco over the last six quarters. The overall RAD index value for Black/African American individuals over that period is 0.95. That is, the ratio of stops per victims of violent crimes for Black/African American individuals is 5% lower than that same ratio for white individuals. In this case, the RAD index suggests a similar frequency of stops of Black/African American compared to white individuals over the last six quarters after adjusting for victims of violent crimes.



Figure 2: RAD Index for Black/African American, 2023-2025 by Quarter

Figure 3 shows the RAD index for Hispanic/Latine individuals in San Francisco over the last six quarters. The overall RAD index value for Hispanic/Latine individuals over that period is 0.56. That is, the ratio of stops per victims of violent crimes for Hispanic/Latine individuals is 44% lower than that of white individuals. In this case, the RAD index does not show a disparity in stops of Hispanic/Latine compared to white individuals over the last six quarters after adjusting for victims of violent crime.



Figure 3: RAD Index for Hispanic/Latine American from 2023- 2025 by Quarter

Suspect Adjusted Disparity Index

As noted above, San Francisco suspects and victims may not share racial demographic characteristics. To improve simplicity, using suspect demographics in an analysis might better reflect enforcement activity, as in the next benchmark - Suspect Adjusted Disparity (SAD) index. Highlighting suspect information in a benchmark allows for a count of police contact based on law enforcement data that may be more readily available. Suspect information is usually captured during a law enforcement encounter, however the information provided does not always match the information later gathered during an arrest. The SAD index relies on reported information from the public or developed by officers during an investigation, which may include societal bias and individual perceptions. As noted with the RAD index, adding another benchmark analysis provides a new viewpoint from which to observe, measure and report on potential disparities. It also provides the opportunity to monitor more than a single benchmark over time to observe trends.

The SAD index also uses a ratio of ratios, where levels of each suspect demographic group are the denominators. The SAD index compares the number of suspects of violent crime against the number of stops per demographic group and compares that ratio for a group of interest against the ratio for the baseline group (e.g. White). In this analysis, two groups of interest are analyzed – Black/African American and Hispanic/Latine suspects of violent crime. This ratio is compared to white suspects of violent crime. Any violent crime with more than 20 people associated with the crime has been excluded as an outlier (e.g. mass arrest).

Equation 2: Example SAD Index Calculation

$$SAD\ Index_{Black} = \frac{Stops_{Black}/Suspects_{Black}}{Stops_{White}/Suspects_{White}}$$

This methodology avoids the assumption that victims and suspects share demographic groups, as assumed in the RAD index. The SAD index does, however, capture potential individual and societal biases by including suspects reported to police. The SAD index only considers suspects of violent crimes.

Figure 4 shows the SAD index for Black/African American individuals over the last six quarters in San Francisco. The overall SAD index for Black/African American individuals over the last six quarters is 0.26. In other words, the ratio of suspects to stops for Black/African American individuals is 74% less than the same ratio for white individuals. The SAD index suggests no disparity in stops for Black/African American individuals compared to white individuals over the last six quarters after adjusting for suspects in violent crimes.



Figure 4: SAD Index for Black/African American from 2023-2025 by Quarter

Figure 5 shows the SAD index for Hispanic/Latine individuals over the last six quarters. The overall SAD index for Hispanic/Latine individuals over the last six quarters is 0.46. In other words, the ratio of suspects to stops for Hispanic/Latine individuals is 64% less than the same ratio for white individuals. The SAD index does not suggest a disparity in stops for Hispanic/Latine compared to white individuals over the last six quarters after adjusting for suspects in violent crimes.



Figure 5: SAD Index for Hispanic/Latine from 2023- 2025 by Quarter

Not at Fault Crash Traffic Analytic Layout

The not at fault crash traffic analytic layout (TAL) compares the demographic data of individuals stopped in vehicles by officers with the demographic data of drivers in San Francisco. This benchmark was originally presented by Alpert, Et. Al in 2004[9], and further utilized by the State of California in the 2020 RIPA Technical report[10]. Instead of using victims or suspects of crime as the comparator population, this benchmark uses individual vehicle drivers who are 'selected' at random. To obtain this sample, data are compiled from the individuals involved in a serious vehicle crash in San Francisco and who were found not at fault. These data serve as a proxy for the overall driving population.[11] This removes some of the dissimilarities in the population that exist when using census data, such as residency in San Francisco and age.

Using crash data for comparison with stops data, the proportion of stops involving a specific demographic group of interest is compared to the proportion of crashes involving the same specific demographic. This calculation is repeated for each demographic group of interest. A result of 1.0 denotes similarity between the potential of being stopped and the sample of drivers in each demographic group on the road. A ratio above 1.0 indicates more stops than expected for that demographic group, while a ratio below 1.0 indicates less than expected stops for that demographic group. The calculation is summarized below:

Equation 3: Example of TAL Calculation

$$TAL_{white} = \frac{\frac{Stops_{white}}{Stops_{total}}}{\frac{Collision_{white}}{Collision_{total}}}$$

Figure 6 shows the TAL for each demographic group for San Francisco over the last six quarters. The graph shows:

- The proportion of Asian/Pacific Islander individuals in the stops data is about 34% higher than their proportion in the crash data.

[9] Alpert, G. P., Smith, M.R., Dunham, R.G. (2004). Toward a better benchmark: Assessing the utility of not at-fault traffic crash data in racial profiling research. Justice Research and Policy, 6, 43 – 69.
[10] https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/ripa/ripa-tech-report-2020.pdf
[11] Withrow, B.L. & Williams, H. (2015). Proposing a benchmark based on vehicle collision data in racial profiling research. Criminal Justice Review, 40, 449 – 469.

- The proportion of Black/African American individuals in the stops data is about 19% higher than their proportion in the crash data.
- The proportion of white individuals in the stops data is about 27% higher than their proportion in the crash data.
- The proportion of Hispanic/Latine individuals in the stops data is about 15% lower than their proportion in the crash data.



Figure 6: Ratio of Stops to Crashes by Demographic Group, 2023-2025

To quantify the significance of these differences in proportion by demographic group between the stops and crash datasets, the Department utilized a two-proportion z-test at a p-value of 0.1. At this p-value, the differences between stops and crash proportions were statistically significant for all groups except Black/African American.

A two-proportion z-test compares the proportions of two independent groups to determine if the difference between them is statistically significant. Used here, the test determines if the differences between the racial categories are statistically significant, meaning more reliable than chance. A p-value is a statistical value that indicates the probability of observing results as extreme as or more extreme than what was observed – assuming the null hypothesis is true. A 0.1 p-value indicates a significance threshold of

10% and any p-value under that suggests rejecting the null hypothesis in favor of the alternative hypothesis.

CRSTAL Conclusions

In an effort to improve the Department's understanding of disparities in police action which may or may not exist, the Department is introducing the CRSTAL set of benchmarks. As top researchers have shown time and again, benchmarking police contact, and outcomes is a challenging issue without a clear solution. While the benchmarks introduced in the CRSTAL analysis provide a more holistic view of potential disparities, each benchmark comes with its own strengths and challenges which cannot be ignored. Each additional benchmark highlights a different subgroup of the population: crime victims, crime suspects, and the driving population and their interaction with law enforcement to illustrate a measurement of law enforcement contact by race. Each one provides unique insight and should be considered both individually and collectively, however, they do not lend themselves to ideal comparison given their unique subgroup metrics.

Each benchmark displays data of law enforcement contact without contextual explanation limiting the ability to draw conclusions. More research is needed to explain the causality of the data displayed in the additional benchmarks. Criminological research acknowledges a variety of predispositions, environmental factors, historical divestment, targeted discrimination and many more factors that could influence disparities. The research of causality is beyond the scope of the present report.

Over time, as trends develop in these benchmarks, further review of the underlying data may provide additional insight. Such changes might include changes to the makeup of comparison populations, changes to enforcement action, or catalyzing events in the community. As underlying data is influenced by various factors, some benchmarks may be more appropriate than others.

Taken together, these benchmarks present a more complete picture of, as compared to previous analysis, SFPD enforcement contacts. The policing and public safety needs and demands of the community are wide and varied. By providing these four benchmarks, SFPD is differentiating among some of the types of work that officers perform. Further, it is improving the communication of the complexities of 21st Century work of law enforcement by sharing this analysis, the underlying data, the positive and negative

aspects to each methodology, and the code that was developed and used to produce the analyses. These efforts demonstrate SFPD's commitment to transparency and accountability, and through this and the resulting actions, seeks to build trust in all communities, provide Safety with Respect for All.

CRSTAL Methodologies

This section provides a more in-depth description of the methodologies used in the above benchmarks, including any assumptions made or peculiarities in the data.

Risk Adjusted Disparity Index

The Risk Adjusted Disparity (RAD) index is a method of statistical measurement that adjusts for a specific community's potential risk of victimization. It can be used to compare any type of demographic category. Here, the Department has employed it for the race/ethnicity category. This methodology allows for comparison of racial groups across a population. The RAD was developed by Sherman and Kumar[12] (2021) and has been used in the United Kingdom. The RAD index has yet to be a mainstream measurement in The United States. In their own words, Sherman & Kumar note

"… measuring the racial balance of preventive policing can be calculated from a Risk-Adjusted Disparity (RAD) Index. In that index, the denominator would always be a measure of crime or harm per capita in each group; the numerator would be a measure of police action. Disparities in proactive police activities, such as stop and search or patrol time, could therefore be adjusted by the racial disparities in criminal victimization that preventive policing aims to equalize. What might look like disparities in policing against certain groups would then be understood as an equalizing intervention to reduce disparities in victimization across groups" (2021).

The present RAD index for San Francisco utilizes victims of Part 1 violent crime as the denominator to measure victims per racial group of interest against stops of that same demographic group. It then compares a similar set of metrics (victims and stops) for white individuals. The comparison leads to an index ratio where 1 indicates an exact ratio between white individuals and the racial group of interest. An index number above 1 indicates more stops per victim in the racial group of interest as compared to white stops per victim, whereas a number below 1 indicates less stops per victim in the racial group of interest compared to white stops per victim.

[12] Sherman, L.W., Kumar, S. Equal Protection by Race with Stop and Frisk: a Risk-Adjusted Disparity (RAD) Index for Balanced Policing. *Camb J Evid Based Polic* **5**, 1–19 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s41887-021-00065-4

Methodology

1) Gather the statistical rate for stops for the racial population of interest per 1000 residents within the geographical boundaries in question.
2) Gather the statistical rate for victimization for the racial population of interest per 1000 residents within the same geographical boundary as step 1.
3) Divide the number in step 1 by the number in step 2.
    a) $= \frac{Stops\ (group\ of\ interest)}{Victims\ (group\ of\ interest)}$
    b) This is the ratio for racial population of interest within the geographical boundary selected.
4) Repeat steps 1-3 for the baseline racial population, the number produced is the ratio for the baseline racial population within the geographical boundary selected.
    a) $= \frac{Stops\ (baseline\ group)}{Victims\ (baseline\ group)}$
5) Divide the ratio for racial population of interest (3b) by the ratio for the baseline racial population (4a).
    a) $RAD = \frac{Stops\ (group\ of\ interest) / Victims\ (group\ of\ interest)}{Stops\ (baseline\ group) / Victims\ (baseline\ group)}$
6) The final number is the RAD index. It is a ratio of ratios comparing the racial population of interest to the baseline racial population.

Assumptions & Caveats

To generate the RAD index, its authors make a key assumption that victims of violent crime will by and large be of the same demographics as the suspect committing the crime. The assumption that a suspect and a victim share similar demographics (or are homogeneous) only holds for some demographics within the data but not for others (see Figure 1).

Victims associated with incidents with arrests for Part 1 crimes including more than 20 arrestees are excluded from the Part 1 Violent Crime count to prevent individuals arrested during a mass arrest (usually tied to protests) from being included in the data.

Suspect Adjusted Disparity Index

The Suspect Adjusted Disparity Index (SAD) similarly to the RAD is a statistical measurement of disparity using suspects of police recorded violent crime as the denominator. SAD has been pioneered in the United Kingdom by the Home Office (analogous to the US Department of Justice). Instead of using the popular resident population benchmark, the Home Office-produced disparity ratios alongside the population data to compare differences.

Methodology

1) Gather the stop and search rate for suspects of violent crime for the racial group of interest.
2) Gather the total number of stops of the racial group of interest.
3) Divide the stop and search rate by the number of suspect stops for the racial group of interest.
    a) $= \frac{Stops\ (group\ of\ interest)}{Suspects\ (group\ of\ interest)}$
4) Repeat steps 1-3 for the baseline racial group.
    a) $= \frac{Stops\ (baseline\ group)}{Suspects\ (baseline\ group)}$
5) Divide the number from step 3 by the number from step 4.
    a) $SAD = \frac{Stops\ (group\ of\ interest) / Suspects\ (group\ of\ interest)}{Stops\ (baseline\ group) / Suspects\ (baseline\ group)}$
6) The final number is the SAD index. It is a ratio of ratios comparing the racial population of interest to the baseline racial population.

Not at Fault Crash Traffic Analytic Layout

The TAL utilizes a z-test for proportions and may seem statistically complicated. In this context, the statistical method tests for a null hypothesis that the two proportions of crash to stops for a racial group of interest are equal. Several scholars have identified the demographics of not-at-fault drivers involved in traffic crashes as a best-practice for benchmarking police stops as it is the most accurate data available to quantify the driving

population demographics.[13][14] The data serves as a largely neutral benchmark because police are required to respond to traffic crashes when injuries are involved, making it independent of any discretionary behavior that could intentionally, or unintentionally, alter the subject demographics.

The benefits of this approach to benchmarking police stops are:

1) This subset of the driving population more closely matches drivers who may be stopped by police, especially as compared to a census population benchmark.
2) Random occurrence data source as officers are required to respond to traffic crashes resulting in injuries.
3) Relatively simple to collect and interpret results without the need for complex modeling or methodologies.

The drawbacks of this approach to benchmarking police stops are:

1) Some locations may be more prone to traffic crashes, introducing over saturation into the data based on which drivers need to pass though certain locations.
2) Relatively sparse data source because there are a relatively low number of crashes resulting in injuries especially in certain areas of the City.
3) Is not comparable to non-vehicular stops which makes up approximately 45% of the stops by the Department.

Methodology

1. Calculate standard error (SE) of crash to stops for each group of interest to determine expected variance between proportions based on each unique sample size.

   a. $SE = \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}$

[13] Alpert, G. P., Smith, M.R., Dunham, R.G. (2004). Toward a better benchmark: Assessing the utility of not-at-fault-traffic crash data in racial profiling research. *Justice Research and Policy, 6,* 43 – 69.
[14] Withrow, B.L. & Williams, H. (2015). Proposing a benchmark based on vehicle collision data in racial profiling research. *Criminal Justice Review, 40,* 449 – 469.

i. *p*= total stops for group of interest *n*= total crashes for group of interest

2. Calculate Z-score which tells us the range of normality between proportions based on standard error.

   a. $Z = \frac{\hat{p} - p_0}{SE}$

      i. $\hat{p}$ = the same proportion p_0 = is the null hypothesis proportion *SE* = from step 1

3. Calculate p-value, based on the z-score, to test the likelihood of the results being realized at random. (at significance level 0.10).

Data Availability

Data tables utilized for this analysis, along with raw code utilized are available at https://github.com/sfpd-public/crstal_analysis

Raw stops data utilized for this analysis are located on DataSF, available at: https://data.sfgov.org/Public-Safety/Police-Department-Stop-Data/ubqf-aqzw/about_data

Use of Force Data Methodology Update

Policy Changes Drive Changes to Data Collection

On September 4, 2024, the San Francisco Police Commission adopted a revision of the General Order 5.01 - Use of Force & Proper Control of a Person policy. This revised General Order went into effect on October 19th, 2024.

The updated Use of Force policy shifted the **Types of Force** criteria. It broadened the definition of Type I non-reportable Use of Force and narrowed Type II reportable Use of Force. It updated the Type I Use of Force documentation methodology and narrowed the definition of Type II reportable Use of Force.

The 2024 policy also changed the reporting criteria and method of reporting in the **Drawing and Exhibiting a Firearm** section.

For the purposes of reporting, the Use of Force data in this Q4 2024 report accounts for 1 October 2024 through 31 December 2024 to provide the quarterly Use of Force statistics. The readers should approach the report with careful understanding and consideration of the changes which may have impacted the overall count of reportable Uses of Force under the revised October 2024 Use of Force standard.

What Policy Changes Were Made?

Type of Force Revision

Most significantly, the October 2024 policy changed the reporting threshold for uses of force. The new standard changed the reporting criteria: when a physical interaction does not result in pain or injury, or subject does not report complaint of pain or injury resulting from physical control hold, the interaction is now non-reportable. Possible impacted metrics for this change in the Q4 2024 Quarterly Report is Type of Force used: Physical Control Hold/Take Down.

Type I [non-reportable] Uses of Force revisions are as follows:

> *Type I force occurs when an officer's physical interaction with a subject (2) does not cause pain or injury; or (2) the subject does not report pain or injury.*

Drawing and Exhibiting a Firearm Revision

The October 2024 Policy also changed the method of reporting of Drawing or Exhibiting a Firearm (but not Pointing a Firearm at a Person) to include documentation method with Body Worn Cameras or CAD. This change does not impact metrics in this Quarterly report but may impact on future analysis that combines data or metrics from Drawing and Exhibiting a Firearm and Uses of Force.

Drawing and Exhibiting a Firearm revisions are as follows:

Sections 5a and 5b were combined into a new section Sa. The language was amended and now reads in full "the officer shall document and articulate the justification for the Drawing and Exhibiting of the firearm on BWC or CAD or in the corresponding incident report and shall notify a supervisor.

Additionally *Reportable Use of Force* was amended to now include,

"Officers shall be required to provide a written report for uses of force only when (1) the use of force resulted in a physical injury, including where the officer believes the use of force is likely to have caused a physical injury or where a person has complained of a physical injury; or (2) an officer removed a firearm from a holster and pointed the firearm at a person or used it to compel a person to comply. In all other instances involving a reportable use of force, the officers shall satisfy these reporting requirements using body-worn cameras, to the maximum extent possible".

Technical Notes

SFPD transitioned to the Benchmark Uses of Force Data Collection system on May 15th, 2024. The transition to an electronic entry system allowed the department to further collect Use of Force and Drawing and Exhibiting a Firearm data. In this new transition, the Airport Bureau Uses of Force data can now be integrated into the department Use of Force data collection system without interface with the San Mateo County systems of record.

Dataset Handling and Adjustments

As the department produced the QADR for the new update of Use of Force reporting criteria and methodology in October 2024, along with the Benchmark Use of Force data collection system, certain instances of the data required verification, alteration, or transformation to be restructured for accurate analysis. Where technical corrections to

the data collection system were necessary, they were provided to the Benchmark application Team for remediation and improvement of the data collection form. As such, the following adjustments to the data were necessary:

Field(s)	Application or Caveat
UoF Subject, UoF Officer information	UoF Subject and UoF Officer information as they were not populated in an accurate manner were verified utilizing incident report via Crime Data Warehouse and Supervisory Use of Force log via Benchmark system. The erroneous or missing data then being integrated into a report for complete and accurate analysis and reporting.
Airport Data	Due to the transition to a new Use of Force Collection system as of May 15th, 2024, Airport Bureau Supervisory Use of Force Evaluation forms have been integrated into the rest of the Department's Use of Force data as of Q2 2024. As such, Airport Bureau data is now available for publication in this report.

Qualitative Notes

The updated 2024 policy implementation changed the reporting requirement for Type I Uses of Force criteria. When use of force incident resulting in no injuries or subject complain of pain, officers are not required to report the use of force. This change impacts the reportable threshold of Physical Control/Take Down type of force. Due to the changes in the use of force standard, data captured under the October 2024 policy may be lower than the previous Type I Uses of Force categories in adjustment to the new reporting standards.

Future Analysis

To better understand the full extent of Uses of Force in comparison from 2016 standard, 2022 standard and the new 2024 standard, future analysis may involve advanced technology to capture the documentation from Body Worn Camera, CAD and incident report to provide a complete comparison for Type I Uses of Force, attempting to understand the actuality of numerical changes in the uses of force.

Stops Data Error Update

Stops Data Collection Transition & Associated Errors

SFPD's ongoing efforts to transform its administration and operations into a 21st Century Policing agency have included several themes. The outstanding work underway in the United States Department of Justice Collaborative Reform Initiative (USDOJ CRI) Use of Force and Bias recommendations is also representative of those themes. Specifically, to meet the recommendations of CRI and to advance the management approaches of the Department, it has been necessary to make significant improvements to data collection, validation, and analysis. Further explanation of the changes in 2023 and 2024, and Stops data collection challenges can be found in Quarterly Activity and Data Report of Quarter 1 through 3, 2024.

Improvement of the Stops Data Collection over time

California Department of Justice Submission Errors Over Time

Please see the chart below illustrating the breakdown of records with errors submitted to CA DOJ versus those with no errors over time.



Note: Please note that these are the official error statistics for the 2023, 2024, and 2025 Stops Data, as submitted to the California Department of Justice. SFPD is actively improving the data collection system to address current issues and prevent future errors, ensuring better data quality moving forward.

Statistics of Q1 Stop Data Fields Affected by Errors

Q1 Metrics	Affected by errors?	Number of records	Number of records affected by errors	Number of unusable records	Number of records used for analysis
Number of Stops	No	7917	0	0	7917
Number of Stops by Race or Ethnicity	No	7917	0	0	7917
Number of Stops per Cap by Race or Ethnicity	No	7917	0	0	7917
Number of Searches by Basis of Search	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Number of Searches by Search Type (Administrative, Discretionary, and Other)	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Number of Searches by Search Type (Administrative, Discretionary, and Other) and Race or Ethnicity	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Yield Rates by Search Type and Race or Ethnicity	Yes	1247	35	9	1238
Yield Rates by Race or Ethnicity	Yes	1247	35	9	1238
Number of Searches Per Cap by Race or Ethnicity	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Stops Self Initiated vs Dispatched	No	7917	0	0	7917
Searches Self Initiated vs Dispatched	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Stops Self Initiated vs Dispatched by Race or Ethnicity	No	7917	0	0	7917

Q1 Metrics	Affected by errors?	Number of records	Number of records affected by errors	Number of unusable records	Number of records used for analysis
Searches Self Initiated vs Dispatched by Race or Ethnicity	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Number of Searches by Race or Ethnicity	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Number of Stops by Age	No	7917	0	0	7917
Number of Searches by Age	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Number of Stops by Gender	No	7917	0	0	7917
Number of Searches by Gender	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Number of Stops by District	No	7917	0	0	7917
Number of Searches by District	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Basis of Search by Race or Ethnicity	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Basis of Search by Age	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Basis of Search by Gender	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Result of Search	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Result of Search by Race or Ethnicity	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Result of Search by Age	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Result of Search by Gender	Yes	1247	9	9	1238
Reason for Stop	No	7917	0	0	7917
Reason for Stop by Race or Ethnicity	No	7917	0	0	7917
Reason for Stop by Age	No	7917	0	0	7917

Q1 Metrics	Affected by errors?	Number of records	Number of records affected by errors	Number of unusable records	Number of records used for analysis
Reason for Stop by Gender	No	7917	0	0	7917
Result of Stop	No	7917	0	0	7917
Result of Stop by Race or Ethnicity	No	7917	0	0	7917
Result of Stop by Age	No	7917	0	0	7917
Result of Stop by Gender	No	7917	0	0	7917

Note: These are the official error statistics for Q1 2025 Stops Data, as submitted to the California Department of Justice. However, SFPD continues to improve the data collection system to reduce errors and enhance data quality moving forward. Although errors persist in Q1, the analysis for the QADR was not impacted.

Quarterly Activity and Data Report
Quarter 1, 2025

SFPD stands for safety with respect for all. We will:

- Engage in just, transparent, unbiased, and responsive policing.
- Do so in the spirit of dignity and in collaboration with the community.
- Maintain and build trust and respect as the guardian of constitutional and human rights.

2025 Q1 Overview



107,377 Calls for Service
- 5.6% decrease compared to Q1-2024

8,479 Stops
- 1,387 resulting in searches (16.4%)

246 Incidents Using Force
- 0.23% of all calls for service
- 537 total uses of force

4,753 Arrests

1 Department of Police Accountability Bias-related Complaint(s) Received

Data collected during the pandemic and recovery period reflect the unique circumstances of the time. Users should take care when comparing data trends across pandemic and non-pandemic response timeframes.

Suspects

Suspects Observed or Reported

The suspect information provided includes descriptions provided by members of the public or observed by Department members and documented in police incident reports. Individuals are listed as "Other" when race information is not included in the category of "Asian/Pacific Islander," Black/African American,", "Hispanic/Latino," "Native American," or "White."

Suspects by Race/Ethnicity	January 1, 2025 - March 31, 2025				
DESCRIPTION	Jan	Feb	Mar	Q1 2025 Suspects	% of Total Suspects Q1 2025
Asian/ Pacific Islander	135	109	111	355	6.3%
Black/ African American	639	605	616	1860	32.9%
Hispanic/ Latino	383	345	373	1101	19.5%
Native American	3	5	4	12	0.2%
White	431	418	464	1313	23.2%
Others	349	304	363	1016	18.0%
Total	**1,940**	**1,786**	**1,931**	**5,657**	**100.00%**

The total suspects with an identified race/ethnicity observed and reported in Q1 2025 (5,657) declined by 19% from Q1 2024 (6,952). Black/African Americans accounted for approximately 33% of all suspects observed and reported in Q1 2025. Unknown suspects and suspects of unknown race or ethnicity are not included and represent approximately 32% (2,655) of all incidents reported (8,312).

Suspects

Black/African American individuals have been the highest demographic of Suspects observed and/or reported for the last 6 quarters (Q4 2023 – Q1 2025). However, data captured in Q1 2025 (1,860) shows a decline by approximately 21% of Suspects observed and/or reported as Black/African American when compared to Q1 2024 (2,364).

SUSPECTS BY RACE/ETHNICITY, last 6 quarters



	Q4 2023	Q1 2024	Q2 2024	Q3 2024	Q4 2024	Q1 2025
Asian/ Pacific Islander	315	368	365	366	375	355
Black/ African American	2,659	2,364	2,392	2,453	2,219	1,860
Hispanic/ Latino	1,373	1,245	1,385	1,231	1,202	1,101
Native American	20	15	7	15	19	12
White	1,444	1,491	1,465	1,560	1,383	1,313
Others	1,413	1,469	1,435	1,495	1,118	1,016
Total	7,224	6,952	7,049	7,120	6,316	5,657

Note: Subject data is extracted from incident reports via the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Suspect." Records with Unknown Race/Ethnicity data are not included.

Suspects

Black/African American individuals have been the highest demographic of Suspects observed and/or reported for from 2018 through 2024. However, data captured in 2024 (9,428) shows a decline by approximately 20% of Suspects observed and/or reported as Black/African American when compared to 2023 (11,858).



	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Asian/ Pacific Islander	1,713	1,727	1,318	1,399	1,365	1,275	1,474
Black/ African American	15,750	15,211	12,206	12,149	12,224	11,858	9,428
Hispanic/ Latino	5,129	5,217	4,461	5,005	5,479	5,337	5,063
Native American	89	72	71	79	61	64	56
White	7,429	7,032	6,007	7,061	6,824	6,062	5,899
Others	5,947	6,229	5,013	5,945	6,234	6,552	5,517
Total	36,057	35,488	29,076	31,638	32,187	31,148	27,437

Note: Subject data is extracted from incident reports via the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Suspect." Records with Unknown Race/Ethnicity data are not included.

Stops and Searches

Stops and Search data and analysis from 2018 through 2025 are now available through an interactive dashboard hosted on the San Francsico Police Department Website. [SFPD Stop Data Dashboards | San Francisco Police Department] Additionally, data sources for the dashboard is also available on DataSF [SFPD Stops Data | DataSF Open Data Portal] for further self-service analysis. Stop data collection errors are annotated in the Stops data error update section within the QADR Q4 2024 report. The readers should approach the dashboard with careful understanding and consideration of the errors which may have impacted the overall count of Stops and Searches.

Please note: Beginning in Q1 2025 QADR report, Population per capita analysis will be merged into the CRSTAL Benchmark analysis to better contextualize the information and enhance public understanding of police enforcement activities. Additionally, the SFPD has integrated the census benchmarking analysis to a web-based dashboard along with the Stops and Search dashboard, located here: SFPD Stop Data Dashboards | San Francisco Police Department. By moving the analysis to an online published dashboard, the Department hopes to increase access to and understanding of the census benchmark.

Use of Force

Use Of Force – Historical 2016-2022



Unless otherwise noted, the term "total uses of force" refers to the number of times force is applied by an officer against an individual to compel compliance.

Changes to the Use of Force Department General Order and associated data collection is discussed in the data exploration section of the Q4 2022 QADR report and should be kept in mind when interpreting these data.

Use of Force – Current Use of Force Policy



During Quarter 1 of 2025, the Department responded to 107,377 total calls for service. Officers were assaulted 51 times and force was used in 246 incidents which represented 0.23% of all calls for service. Of those 246 incidents, force was used 537 times by 303 officers against 303 individuals.

There was one Use of Force incident that resulted in death during Quarter 1 of 2025.

Use of Force

Race/Ethnicity of Individuals Subject to a Use of Force, Q1 2025



Race/Ethnicity	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25
Asian	7.9%	6.1%	7.7%
Black/African American	26.3%	35.2%	42.9%
Hispanic/Latino	42.1%	28.5%	20.8%
White	19.5%	26.8%	20.2%
Other	4.2%	3.4%	8.3%

Per the 2024 October Use of Force Policy, during Q1 of 2025, White individuals represented 22% of total number of individuals subject to uses of force. This rate is 34% for Black/African American individuals, 31% for Hispanic/Latino individuals, and 7% for Asian individuals.

Types Of Force Used – Q1 2025

Under the October 2024 Use of Force Policy, Physical Control Hold/Take Down and Firearm Pointing were the top two types of force used and accounted for 74% of total Uses of Force during Q1 2025.

UoF by Type of Force Description October 2024 UoF Policy	
Type of Force Description	**Q1 2025**
Chemical Agent	12
ERIW	8
ERIW 40 mm	6
Firearm OIS	2
Firearm Pointing	258
Impact Weapon	2
Other	17
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	137
SpikeStrips	50
Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	41
Vehicle Intervention	4
Grand Total	**537**

USE OF FORCE RESULTING IN DEATH

On January 27, 2025, at approximately 4:56 p.m., uniformed officers with the San Francisco Police Department responded to the area of Mission and 9th Streets regarding a shooting.

Officers arrived on scene and located an adult male victim with apparent gunshot wounds being treated by paramedics. The victim was transported to a local hospital with life-threatening injuries. Officers received information that a suspect was possibly in a nearby building. Officers set up a perimeter around the building to safely apprehend the suspect and developed a strategic plan utilizing the assistance of additional SFPD resources such as Specialist, Tactical, and Hostage Negotiation teams. The suspect failed to comply and refused to exit the building.

During this contact, an officer-involved shooting occurred.

Officers made an entry and located the suspect who was suffering from life-threatening injuries. Officers and paramedics rendered aid on scene. Despite the lifesaving efforts of first responders, the suspect was pronounced deceased.

Arrests

Total Arrests by Quarter – 2020 – 2025 Q1



There were 4,753 arrests during Quarter 1 of 2025, a 17% increase from Q1-2024 (4,048). White individuals accounted for 34% of all arrests.[15]



[15] Arrests made by Department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported in San Mateo County data and are not included in these data.

Arrests

Total Arrests

Overall arrests of White individuals increased by 5% in Quarter 1 of 2025 compared to Quarter 1 of 2024.

Note: *Detailed data regarding age groups and gender can be found later in this report.*

Percentage of Total Arrests			
Race/ Ethnicity	Q1-2024 (n=4,048)	Q1-2025 (n=4,753)	%Δ from 2024
Asian	6%	6%	0%
Black/ African American	33%	31%	-2%
Hispanic/Latino	29%	26%	-3%
White	29%	34%	5%
Unknown	4%	4%	0%

Arrests By District

Arrests made by Department members within the City and County of San Francisco jurisdiction increased in Quarter 1 of 2025 compared to Quarter 1 of 2024 by 17%.

Arrests By District, Q1 2024 vs Q1 2025			
District	Q1 2024	Q1 2025	% change
Co. A - Central	441	417	-5%
Co. B - Southern	613	1,146	87%
Co. C - Bayview	249	305	22%
Co. D - Mission	535	802	50%
Co. E - Northern	453	419	-8%
Co. F - Park	80	100	25%
Co. G - Richmond	135	99	-27%
Co. H - Ingleside	247	245	-1%
Co. I - Taraval	190	183	-4%
Co. J - Tenderloin	1,055	973	-8%
Outside SF	50	64	28%
Total	**4,048**	**4,753**	**17%**

The "Outside SF/Other" category includes arrests made by Department members outside of the City and County of San Francisco as well as some arrests made inside the City and County of San Francisco by agencies other than SFPD that are captured by our Incident Reporting system.

Note: *Arrests made by Department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.*

Bias-Related Complaints

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

The Department is required to obtain information from the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) regarding the total number of complaints received during the reporting period that it characterizes as allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, gender, or gender identity. The Department also is required to include in its report the total number of complaints DPA closed during the reporting period that were characterized as allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, gender, or gender identity, as well as the total number of each type of disposition for such complaints.

Cases Received in Q1-2025

Type of Case Received	# of Cases
Racial Bias	1
Gender Bias	0
Transphobic Bias	0
Both Racial and Gender Bias	0
TOTAL	1

DPA received 226 total cases for the quarter.
1 Officer(s) named for allegations of Racial or Gender Bias.
Total Cases received in 2025 involving Racial or Gender Bias: 1 Case(s)

During Quarter 1 of 2025, DPA completed 4 complaint investigations in which there was an allegation of racial or gender bias.

Q1-2025 Case Closures & Dispositions

Type of Case	Sustained	Withdrawn	Unfounded	No Finding	Insufficient Evidence	Proper Conduct	Referral	TOTAL
Racial Bias	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	**3**
Homophobic Bias	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Gender Bias	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Transphobic Bias	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	**1**
Racial, Homophobic , Gender Bias	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
TOTAL	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**4**

*Source: Department of Police Accoutability
DPA closed a total of 229 cases for the quarter, including above.
DPA closed a total of 229 cases for the year, including above

Bias-Related Complaints

BIAS-RELATED COMPLAINTS RECEIVED BY SFPD, AND INVESTIGATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

As part of the Department's commitment to transparency, the Department also reports on all bias-related complaints received internally from members of the Department and forwarded to the Department of Human Resources (DHR) for investigation. Closed cases may include complaints received in previous quarters. Bias-related complaints are referred to as Employment Equal Opportunity (EEO) cases by DHR.

Q1-2025 Bias Cases Received

EEO Cases Received	Q1-2025
Age / Race / Religion and Gender Discrimination	
Disability Discrimination	
Gender/Gender Identity Discrimination	
Harassment/Non-EEO	
Hostile Work Environment	2
Medical Discrimination	
Race Discrimination	2
Retaliation	
Sexual Harassment	1
Sexual Orientation	
TOTAL	**5**

Complainants: 4 Department Member(s); 1 Outside Civilian(s)
Respondents (Named): 0 SFPD; 5 Sworn Officer(s); 1 Civilian(s)
Total Respondents: 0 SFPD Named; 5 Sworn Officer(s); 1 Civilian(s)

Type of Case	Administrative Closures			Sustained	TOTAL
	Rej/Ref/WD Non-EEO	Insufficient Evidence	Misc/RTS*		
Age / Race / Religion and Gender Discrimination	1	1			**2**
Gender Discrimination					**0**
Gender Identity					**0**
Harassment/ Non-EEO					**0**
Hostile Work Environment	5				**5**
Marital/Parental Discrimination					**0**
Medical Discrimination					**0**
Race Discrimination		1			**1**
Sex Discrimination					**0**
Religion					**0**
Retaliation					**0**
Sexual Harassment					**0**
Sexual Orientation					**0**
Slurs/Inappropriate Comment					**0**
Weight Discrimination					**0**
TOTAL	**6**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**8**

Source: SFPD Risk Management EEO Quarterly Report
*RTS=Right to Sue

Domestic Violence Reporting
- Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b

Domestic Violence Reporting - Background

In November 2021, the Board of Supervisors approved, and Mayor Breed signed, legislation amending the San Francisco Administrative Code to require certain data involving Domestic Violence be reported on a quarterly basis starting in the first quarter of 2022. The report is to be submitted on a quarterly basis to the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, Office of Racial Equity, the Human Rights Commission, the Department on the Status of Women, and the PoliceCommission.

Domestic Violence Calls for Service and Investigations

Domestic Violence, also known as Intimate Partner Violence, is abbreviated as DV for brevity in this report. For the purposes of this report, Admin Code 96D defines Domestic Violence as: *"Domestic Violence" means the crime defined in Section 273.5 and the crimes punishable under Section 243 (e){1), of the California Penal Code.*

SFPD responds to calls for service (CFS) received by the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) whether as a 911 emergency or through the non-emergency line. After gathering information from the caller, DEM staff has the responsibility of determining the appropriate code for the call, based on the information provided, and to dispatch units to the location as either a Priority A (highest), Priority B, or Priority C.

Upon arrival, SFPD officers conducted a thorough investigation into the allegations of domestic violence. Per SFPD policy, calls for service are coded with a final disposition of domestic violence (DV) in cases in which DV is evident during an officer's investigation.

In some cases, a report may be taken without a call to 911 (self-reporting at a police station, forexample.) In these cases, a call for service number is generated during the report writing process.

This is a quarterly data report from 1 January 2025 through 31 March 2025.

Domestic Violence Reporting
- Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b

Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b Reporting Components

1(A) The number of calls for service for domestic violence that the Police Department received from the Department of Emergency Management for the period of January 1 to March 31, 2025.

Calls for Service, Final Call Code Includes "DV" January 1 - March 31, 2025				
	2025			
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Total
DV Calls for Service	566	475	543	**1584**

1(B) The number of domestic violence cases that the Police Department presented to the District Attorney for investigation and/or prosecution in the prior quarter, and of those cases, the number in which a child or children were present and/or a firearm or firearms were present.

DV INCIDENTS SUBMITTED TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE			
	2025		
	Jan	Feb	Mar
Number of DV Cases Presented to the District Attorney's Office	92	69	79
Number of DV cases referred to the DA in which a child was present	11	7	7
Number of DV cases referred to the DA in which a firearm was present	3	0	0

Confiscation of Weapons: Pursuant to Penal Code § 18250 and Department policy, officers are mandated to confiscate any firearms or other deadly weapons discovered at the scene of a domestic violence incident. The weapon is booked into the Department's Property Room as evidence. As federal and state laws prohibit individuals convicted of a domestic violence charge from owning or acquiring a weapon, the Property Room follows DOJ protocols, including criminal records' checks, to determine if the individual is eligible for release of the weapon.

Presence of Children: SFPD Department General Order 6.09 also outlines the procedures to follow if children are present during a domestic violence incident. DGO 7.04, Children of Arrested Parents, provides guidance to minimize the negative impact and harmful stressors onchildren when a parent/guardian is arrested whether in their presence or not. This policy is considered a national model, highlighting law enforcement's responsibility to ensure a safe environment for children following a traumatic experience such as the arrest ofone's parent.

SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report – Additional Data Tables

Stops Data Q1 2025

Stops and Search data and information from 2018 through Q1 2025 are now available through an interactive dashboard hosted on the San Francsico Police Department Website. [SFPD Stop Data Dashboards | San Francisco Police Department] Additionally, data source for the dashboard is also available on DataSF [[SFPD Stops Data | DataSF Open Data Portal]] for further self-service analysis.

Stops Resulting in contact with the Department of Homeland Security or it's subordinate organization:

There were no stops result involving the Department of Homeland Security or its subordinate's organizations for Quarter 1 of 2025

Calls for Service, Q1 2025

Calls for Service*

The Department responded to 107,377 total calls for service from January 1 through March 31, 2025.





911 Calls assigned to SFPD have declined year over year since 2019.

Data Source: San Francisco Police Department Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD). Calls for Service data represent calls to the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) via the 911 system and assigned to SFPD.

*Please note Calls for Service data underwent a methodology update to more accurately capture SFPD call volume. This methodology change is reflected beginning with the 2025 Q1 Quarterly Activity and Data Report. Call volume for prior years on the above chart has also been adjusted to the new methodology.

Suspects, Q1 2025

SUSPECTS OBSERVED AND/OR REPORTED TO SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

Suspect information/description is either provided by a member of the public, reported directly to the police or through dispatch, or is observed by a Department member during a self-initiated call for service in which there is reasonable suspicion or probable cause for an officer to conduct a stop. The suspect information is documented in a police incident report that is generated from the call for service. Individuals are listed as "Other" when race information is not included in the category of "Asian/Pacific Islander", Black/African American", "Hispanic/Latino", "Native American" or "White."

The following table summarizes suspect descriptions gathered from incident reports through the means stated above. The data shows approximately 33% of the individuals observed and/or reported are Black/African American.

Suspects by Race/Ethnicity	January 1, 2025 - March 31, 2025				
DESCRIPTION	Jan	Feb	Mar	Q1 2025 Suspects	% of Total Suspects Q1 2025
Asian/ Pacific Islander	135	109	111	355	6.3%
Black/ African American	639	605	616	1860	32.9%
Hispanic/ Latino	383	345	373	1101	19.5%
Native American	3	5	4	12	0.2%
White	431	418	464	1313	23.2%
Others	349	304	363	1016	18.0%
Total	**1,940**	**1,786**	**1,931**	**5,657**	**100.00%**



Note: Suspect data is extracted from incident reports via the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Suspect." Records with Unknown Race/Ethnicity data are not included.

Suspects, Q1 2025

Black/African American individuals have been the highest demographic of Suspects observed and/or reported for the last 6 quarters (Q4 2023 – Q1 2025). However, data captured in Q1 2025 (1,860) shows a decline by approximately 21% of Suspects observed and/or reported as Black/African American when compared to Q1 2024 (2,364).



	Q4 2023	Q1 2024	Q2 2024	Q3 2024	Q4 2024	Q1 2025
Asian/ Pacific Islander	315	368	365	366	375	355
Black/ African American	2,659	2,364	2,392	2,453	2,219	1,860
Hispanic/ Latino	1,373	1,245	1,385	1,231	1,202	1,101
Native American	20	15	7	15	19	12
White	1,444	1,491	1,465	1,560	1,383	1,313
Others	1,413	1,469	1,435	1,495	1,118	1,016
Total	7,224	6,952	7,049	7,120	6,316	5,657

Note: Suspect data is extracted from incident reports via the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Suspect." Records with Unknown Race/Ethnicity data are not included.

Officers Assaulted, Q1 2025

Officers Assaulted - Trailing 6 Quarters

In Quarter 1 of 2025, there were a total of 51 officers assaulted.



Total Use of Force Overview
January 1, 2016, through December 7, 2022



Changes to the Use of Force Department General Order and associated data collection is discussed in the data exploration section in Q4 2022 Quarterly report and should be kept in mind when interpreting these data.

Where possible this report provides data for December 8, 2022, through December 31, 2022, and complete Q1 2023 data to account for December 2022 UoF policy change and allow for historical context and tracking of data not provided in QADR Report for Q4 2022.

Use of Force, Q1 2025

The SFPD General Order 5.01, Use of Force policy changed in October 2024. Please reference DGO 5.01 for the change adopted in detail.

Changes to the Use of Force Department General Order in October 2024 and associated data collection are discussed in the Use of Force Data update of this report and should be kept in mind when interpreting these data.

Total Use of Force Overview
December 8, 20222, through March 31, 2025



During Quarter 1 of 2025, the Department responded to 107,377 total calls for service. Officers were assaulted 51 times and force was used in 246 incidents which represented 0.23% of all calls for service. Of those 246 incidents, force was used 537 times by 303 officers against 303 individuals.

Use of Force Overview
by Subject Race/Ethnicity

During Quarter 1 of 2025, 22% of the total Uses of Force were against White individuals, 34% were against Black/African American individuals, 31% were against Hispanic/Latino individuals, and 7% were against Asians.

COUNT OF FORCE										
	2022	2023				2024				2025
	Dec 8-31	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1
Asian	4	14	67	37	37	16	32	49	37	39
Black/ African American	53	264	278	246	209	234	296	247	166	185
Hispanic/ Latino	43	158	193	177	159	119	180	182	180	166
White	23	133	123	145	101	136	125	135	121	119
Other	7	20	15	26	51	54	6	32	19	28
	130	**589**	**676**	**631**	**557**	**559**	**639**	**645**	**523**	**537**



Use of Force, Q1 2025

Under the October 2024 Use of Force Policy, during Quarter 1 of 2025, the total count of use of force received by Black/African American individuals accounted for (34%, 185), while White individuals accounted for (22%, 119), and Hispanic individuals accounted for (31%, 166).

Total % Use of Force, Q1 2025 by Race/Ethnicity		
Subject Race	**Q1 2025**	
Asian or Pacific Islander	39	7%
Black	185	34%
Hispanic	166	31%
White	119	22%
Oth/Unk Race & Gender	28	5%
Grand Total	**537**	**100%**



Total Use of Force
Overview by Individual Age

Under the 2024 Use of Force Policy, During Quarter 1 of 2025, 39% of the total Uses of Force were against 18-29 years old individuals, 30% were against 30-39 years old individuals, and 17% were against 40-49 years old individuals.

	COUNT OF FORCE									
	2022	2023				2024				2025
INDIVIDUAL AGE	Dec 8-31	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1
Under 18	12	38	66	44	29	24	53	45	38	20
18-29	40	229	247	204	178	175	202	226	167	209
30-39	43	173	203	187	174	154	234	194	175	160
40-49	24	82	85	114	83	126	83	110	91	91
50-59	4	34	40	38	37	27	36	37	29	30
60+	1	7	14	7	21	12	23	20	8	15
Unknown	6	26	21	37	26	41	8	13	15	12
Grand Total	**130**	**589**	**676**	**631**	**548**	**559**	**639**	**645**	**523**	**537**



Total Use of Force
Overview by Individual Gender

Using the 2024 Use of Force Policy, 86% of the total Uses of Force were against male individuals, and 13% were against female individuals during Quarter 1 of 2025.

	COUNT OF FORCE									
	2022	2023				2024				2025
INDIVIDUAL GENDER	Dec 8-31	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1
Female	17	95	93	85	78	88	95	80	39	69
Male	111	490	580	536	457	465	543	560	477	461
Unkown/Nonbinary	2	4	3	10	13	6	1	5	7	7
Grand Total	**130**	**589**	**676**	**631**	**548**	**559**	**639**	**645**	**523**	**537**



Total Uses of Force
By Force Type

During Quarter 1 of 2025, under the October 2024 Use of Force Policy, Physical Control and Firearm Pointing were the top two types of force used and accounted for 73% of total Uses of Force.



UoF by Type of Force Description October 2024 UoF Policy	
Type of Force Description	**Q1 2025**
Chemical Agent	12
ERIW	8
ERIW 40 mm	6
Firearm OIS	2
Firearm Pointing	258
Impact Weapon	2
Other	17
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	137
SpikeStrips	50
Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	41
Vehicle Intervention	4
Grand Total	**537**

A review of all reported uses of force during Quarter 1 of 2025 found no instances of officers discharging firearms at a moving vehicle, nor any instances where the carotid restraint was employed.

Types of Force by Race/Ethnicity and Gender of Subject January – March 2025

During Quarter 1 of 2025, under the October 2024 Use of Force Policy, Force used against Black/African American Male individuals accounted for 30% Uses of Force, while 27% were against Hispanic Male individuals, and 19% against White Male individuals.

Type of Force by Individual Race and Gender January 1 - March 31, 2025													
Individual Race and Gender	Chemical Agent	ERIW	ERIW 40 mm	Firearm OIS	Firearm Pointing	Impact Weapon	Other	Physical Control Hold/Take Down	SpikeStrips	Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	Vehicle Intervention	Grand Total	% of Calls
A - Asian or Pacific Islander M	1	1	1	1	20	0	4	5	2	2	2	39	7%
B - Black F	1	0	0	0	11	0	0	9	3	2	0	26	5%
B - Black M	4	1	1	0	82	0	5	42	14	10	0	159	30%
H - Hispanic or Latin F	0	0	0	0	8	0	1	9	3	1	0	22	4%
H - Hispanic or Latin M	2	2	2	0	78	1	4	29	12	11	2	143	27%
W - White F	0	0	1	0	8	0	1	4	0	1	0	15	3%
W - White M	1	4	1	1	39	0	0	32	13	13	0	104	19%
W - White Nonbinary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0%
Z - Other/Unkn F	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	1%
Z - Other/Unkn M	3	0	0	0	3	1	0	7	1	1	0	16	3%
Z - Other/Unkn Race and Gender	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	1%
Grand Total	12	8	6	2	258	2	17	137	50	41	4	537	100%

Types of Force by Age of Subject January – March 2025

During Quarter 1 of 2025, per October 2024 use-of-force standard, force used against the individuals in the age group of 18-29 accounted for 39% of Uses of Force, the age group of 30-39 accounted for 30%, and the age group of 40-49 accounted for 17%.

Type of Force by Individual Age Category
January 1 - March 31, 2025

Individual Age Category	Chemical Agent	ERIW	ERIW 40 mm	Firearm OIS	Firearm Pointing	Impact Weapon	Other	Physical Control Hold/Take Down	SpikeStrips	Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	Vehicle Intervention	Grand Total	% of Calls
Under 18	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	4	0	0	0	**20**	**4%**
18-29	3	0	1	0	114	1	5	43	22	19	1	**209**	**39%**
30-39	4	3	1	1	60	0	8	55	16	10	2	**160**	**30%**
40-49	5	3	3	1	38	1	2	23	9	5	1	**91**	**17%**
50-59	0	2	1	0	17	0	0	6	0	4	0	**30**	**6%**
60+	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	6	0	3	0	**15**	**3%**
Unknown	0	0	0	0	8	0	1	0	3	0	0	**12**	**2%**
Grand Total	**12**	**8**	**6**	**2**	**258**	**2**	**17**	**137**	**50**	**41**	**4**	**537**	**100%**

Note: Unknown indicates information was not documented in the report for various reasons (i.e. suspect fled and demographic information was not known). Due to rounding, percentage totals may not add up to exactly 100%.

Types of Force by Call Type, January – March 2025

Per October 2024 Use-of-Force Standard, Part I Violent was the top call type and accounted for 27% of total Uses of Force during Quarter 1 of 2025.

Use of Force by Types of Call and Force Type Description January 1 - March 31, 2025													
Types of Call	**Chemical Agent**	**ERIW**	**ERIW 40 mm**	**Firearm OIS**	**Firearm Pointing**	**Impact Weapon**	**Other**	**Physical Control Hold/Take Down**	**SpikeStrips**	**Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)**	**Vehicle Intervention**	**Grand Total**	**% of Calls**
Part I Violent	4	1	3	1	63	2	11	38	7	12	2	**144**	**27%**
Part I Property	0	0	0	0	47	0	0	11	18	2	0	**78**	**15%**
Wanted Vehicle/Subject	1	1	0	0	46	0	0	7	17	2	1	**75**	**14%**
Suspicious Person	1	0	0	0	21	0	0	23	0	7	0	**52**	**10%**
Person with a gun (221)	1	1	0	1	29	0	1	9	0	0	0	**42**	**8%**
Arrest Made	0	0	0	0	11	0	2	6	3	3	1	**26**	**5%**
Misc	0	0	0	0	13	0	1	1	2	1	0	**18**	**3%**
Resisting Arrest	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	5	0	**17**	**3%**
Person with a knife (219/222)	0	3	2	0	3	0	0	2	0	1	0	**11**	**2%**
Traffic-Related	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	6	1	0	0	**10**	**2%**
All Other Types of Call*	2	2	1	0	23	0	1	25	2	8	0	64	**12%**
Grand Total	**12**	**8**	**6**	**2**	**258**	**2**	**17**	**137**	**50**	**41**	**4**	**537**	**100%**

The table above reflects the top 10 Types of Call. “All Other Types of Call” include the sum of remaining call type categories such as Misc, Traffic Related, Alarm/Check on Well-Being (100/910), Disturbance Calls, etc.

Use of Force by Reason, Q1 2025

Per October 2024 Use of Force Standard, “To Effect a Lawful Arrest, Detention, or Search” was the most common reason for Use of Force in Quarter 1 of 2025.

UoF Reason of Force Description October 2024 UoF Policy - Q1 2025		
UoF Reason of Force	**Total UoF Incidents**	**Total Count of Reason**
Building search	6	8
In defense of others or in self-defense	98	223
Pending Investigation	6	11
To effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search	233	511
To gain compliance with a lawful order	165	380
To overcome resistance orTo prevent escape	177	398
To prevent a person from injuring himself/herself	7	9
To prevent the commission of a public offense	60	150
Grand Total	**246**	**1690**

As noted in the data exploration section, the reason for use of force has gone from a single selection to a multiple select field. This can lead to more reasons for uses of force in data collected in Quarter 2 of 2022 onward than actual Uses of Force counts, as seen above.

Uses of Force by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Age of Officer Q1 2025

During Quarter 1 of 2025, using the October 2024 Use of Force policy, White male officers accounted for 229 (42%) of Uses of Force used, and Asian male officers accounted for 104 (19%) of Uses of Force used, and Hispanic male officers accounted for 103 (19%) as well.

Officers Using Force by Race and Gender
October 2024 UoF Policy - Q1 2025

Officer Race and Gender	Total Uses of Force	Officers Using Force	Department Demographic
A - Asian or Pacific Islander F	4	4	46
A - Asian or Pacific Islander M	104	65	426
Asian Unknown *			0
B - Black F	8	4	33
B - Black M	33	20	132
H - Hispanic F	22	15	89
H - Hispanic M	103	54	299
W - White F	16	11	120
W - White M	229	118	724
Z - Other F	1	1	6
Z - Other M	17	11	39
Grand Total	**537**	**303**	**1914**

**Asian includes Asian and Pacific Islander*
***Other indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions*

Per October 2024 Use of Force Policy, Officers in the age group of 30-39 accounted for 296 (55%) of Uses of Force applied against individuals.

Officers Using Force by Age Category
October 2024 UoF Policy - Q1 2025

Officer Age Category	Total Uses of Force	Officers Using Force	Department Demographic
21-29	95	55	193
30-39	296	166	678
40-49	122	66	577
50-59	22	15	415
60+	2	2	51
Grand Total	**537**	**303**	**1914**

Uses of Force by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Age of Individual Q1 2025

During Quarter 1 of 2025, per October 2024 Use of Force standard, Black male individuals accounted for 159 (29%) of Uses of Force used against, Hispanic male individuals accounted for 143 (27%) of Uses of Force used against, and White male individuals accounted for 104 (19%) of Uses of Force used against.

Individuals by Race and Gender
October 2024 UoF Policy - Q1 2025

Individual Race and Gender	Total Uses of Force	Number of Individuals
A - Asian or Pacific Islander M	39	19
B - Black F	26	17
B - Black M	159	87
H - Hispanic or Latin F	22	17
H - Hispanic or Latin M	143	73
W - White F	15	11
W - White M	104	62
W - White Nonbinary	1	1
Z - Other/Unkn F	6	1
Z - Other/Unkn M	16	11
Z - Other/Unkn Race and Gender	6	4
Grand Total	**537**	**303**

Individuals in the age group of 18-29 accounted for 209 (39%) of Total Use of Force used against, and the age group of 30-39 accounted for 160 (28%) of Total Use of Force.

Individuals by Age Category
October 2024 UoF Policy - Q1 2025

Individual Age Category	Total Uses of Force	Number of Individuals
Under 18	20	11
18-29	209	122
30-39	160	85
40-49	91	52
50-59	30	17
60+	15	7
Unknown	12	9
Grand Total	**537**	**303**

**Unknown indicates data not provided in incident report*

Uses of Force Incidents by Number of Officers Involved Q1 2025

Per the October 2024 Use of Force standard, of 246 total Use of Force incidents, most of the incidents involved 1 officer (137, 56%).

Number of Officers Involved October 2024 UoF Policy - Q1 2025	
Number of Officers	**Number of Incidents**
1	137
2	72
3	17
4	12
5	4
6	1
7	1
8	1
13	1
Grand Total	**246**



Uses of Force Incidents by Number of Individuals Involved Q1 2025

Under the October 2024 Use of Force policy, of 246 total Use of Force incidents, most of the incidents involved 1 individual (210, 85%).

Number of Individuals Involved	
Number of Individuals	**Number of Incidents**
1	210
2	22
3	12
4	1
9	1
Grand Total	**246**



Arrests
by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
Q1-2024 vs. Q1-2025

Overall arrests increased in Quarter 1 of 2025 (4,753) by 17% compared to Quarter 1 of 2024 (4,048).

Arrests By Race/Ethnicity and Gender Q1 2024 vs Q1 2025			
Race and Gender	**Q1 2024**	**Q1 2025**	**% change**
Asian Female	45	52	16%
Asian Male	189	228	21%
Asian Unknown	1	2	100%
Black Female	305	328	8%
Black Male	1,014	1,157	14%
Black Unknown	6	5	-17%
Hispanic Female	163	202	24%
Hispanic Male	995	1,006	1%
Hispanic Unknown	1	5	400%
White Female	248	381	54%
White Male	913	1,207	32%
White Unknown	1	9	800%
Unknown Female	18	24	33%
Unknown Male	111	120	8%
Unknown Race & Gender	38	27	-29%
Total	**4,048**	**4,753**	**17%**



Arrests made by Department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in these data.

Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which the Person Type is listed as "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports in which data was not provided.

Arrests Q1, 2025

Arrests by Age
Q1-2024 vs. Q1-2025

The overall arrests of individuals under the age of 18, decreased by 29% in Quarter 1 of 2025 (114) when compared to arrests in Quarter 1 of 2024 (160). The arrest of individuals age 40-49 increased by 32% in Quarter 1 of 2025 (1,061) when compared to Quarter 1 of 2024 (804).

Arrests By Age Q1 2024 vs Q1 2025			
Age	**Q1 2024**	**Q1 2025**	**% change**
Under 18	160	114	-29%
18-29	1096	1,112	1%
30-39	1363	1,747	28%
40-49	804	1,061	32%
50-59	397	474	19%
60+	228	245	7%
Unknown	0	0	0%
Total	**4,048**	**4,753**	**17%**



Arrests made by Department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.
Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

By District Data

Use of Force Incidents, by District
Q1 – 2025, October 2024 Reporting Standard

During Quarter 1 of 2025, per October 2024 Use of Force standard, Southern District accounted for 49 Use of Force incidents comprising 20% of all districts' use of force incidents.

Use of Force Incidents by District October 2024 UoF Policy - Q1 2025	
Districts	**Total Use of Force Incidents**
A - Central	30
B - Southern	49
C - Bayview	22
D - Mission	24
E - Northern	27
F - Park	5
G - Richmond	6
H - Ingleside	21
I - Taraval	19
J - Tenderloin	38
K - Airport	1
L - Outside SF	7
Grand Total	**246**



By District Data

Number of Individuals on Whom Force Was Used, by District
Q1 – 2025, October 2024 Reporting Standard

Per October 2024 Use of Force Reporting Standard, during Quarter 1 of 2025, Southern and Tenderloin districts accounted for 34% of all uses of force by the number of individuals on whom force was used.

Number of Individuals on Whom Force was Used by District October 2024 UoF Policy - Q1 2025	
Districts	**Number of Individuals**
A - Central	33
B - Southern	59
C - Bayview	32
D - Mission	31
E - Northern	33
F - Park	5
G - Richmond	7
H - Ingleside	26
I - Taraval	24
J - Tenderloin	43
K - Airport	1
L - Outside SF	9
Grand Total	**303**



By District Data

Total Uses of Force, by District
Q1 2025

Uses of Force by District October 2024 UoF Policy - Q1 2025	
Districts	**Total Uses of Force**
A - Central	58
B - Southern	111
C - Bayview	49
D - Mission	59
E - Northern	51
F - Park	9
G - Richmond	11
H - Ingleside	50
I - Taraval	39
J - Tenderloin	71
K - Airport	1
L - Outside SF	28
Grand Total	**537**



During Quarter 1 of 2025, Tenderloin District (71 uses of force), Southern District (111 uses of force) and Mission District (59 uses of force) accounted for 45% of all districts Uses of Force.

By District Data

Total Arrests by District
Q1 – 2024 vs. 2025

In Quarter 1 of 2025, there was an overall increase in arrests of 17% as compared to Quarter 1 of 2024. However, Richmond station arrests (99) decreased by approximately 27% when compared to Q1-2024 (135).

Arrests By District, Q1 2024 vs Q1 2025			
District	**Q1 2024**	**Q1 2025**	**% change**
Co. A - Central	441	417	-5%
Co. B - Southern	613	1,146	87%
Co. C - Bayview	249	305	22%
Co. D - Mission	535	802	50%
Co. E - Northern	453	419	-8%
Co. F - Park	80	100	25%
Co. G - Richmond	135	99	-27%
Co. H - Ingleside	247	245	-1%
Co. I - Taraval	190	183	-4%
Co. J - Tenderloin	1,055	973	-8%
Outside SF	50	64	28%
Total	**4,048**	**4,753**	**17%**



Arrests made by Department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals. Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Arrests totals do not include arrests at the Airport.

Central District

(Company A)

Use of Force

January – March 2025

There was a total of 58 Uses of Force in the Central District. Firearm Pointing (21) accounted for 36% of the type of force used. The peak time for uses of force (17, 29%) was between 1600-1959hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	2
ERIW	1
ERIW 40 mm	2
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	21
Impact Weapon	1
K-9 Bite	0
Other	0
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	20
SpikeStrips	3
Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	8
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**58**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
A - Central	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	3	2	1	4	2	0	**12**	21%
0400-0759	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	**2**	3%
0800-1159	1	3	1	0	3	6	0	**14**	24%
1200-1559	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	**5**	9%
1600-1959	1	4	4	0	4	3	1	**17**	29%
2000-2359	2	1	2	0	1	0	2	**8**	14%
Total	**6**	**11**	**9**	**1**	**12**	**12**	**7**	**58**	100%
Percentage	10%	19%	16%	2%	21%	21%	12%	**100%**	

Central District
(Company A)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2025

White males accounted for 26% of arrests made by Central Station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Company A
Race and Gender	Q1 2025 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	7	2%
Asian Male	32	8%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	24	6%
Black Male	78	19%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	22	5%
Hispanic Male	95	23%
Hispanic Unknown	1	0%
White Female	28	7%
White Male	110	26%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	1	0%
Unknown Male	16	4%
Unknown Race & Gender	3	1%
Total	417	100%



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.” Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn’t provided.

Central District
(Company A)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2025

Individuals age 30-39 accounted for 38% of arrests made by Central Station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrest By Age		Company A
Age	Q1 2025 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	13	3%
18-29	116	28%
30-39	158	38%
40-49	71	17%
50-59	32	8%
60+	27	6%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**417**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.”

Southern District

(Company B)

Use of Force

January – March 2025

There was a total of 111 Uses of Force in the Southern District. Firearm Pointing (50) accounted for 45% of Type of Force used. The peak time for uses of force (36, 32%) was between 0000-0359hr.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	4
ERIW	3
ERIW 40 mm	0
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	50
Impact Weapon	0
K-9 Bite	0
Other	0
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	27
SpikeStrips	14
Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	12
Vehicle Intervention	1
Grand Total	**111**

Time of Day/Day of Week B - Southern	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	3	3	25	5	**36**	32%
0400-0759	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**2**	2%
0800-1159	7	4	1	0	4	0	0	**16**	14%
1200-1559	2	4	3	5	1	3	0	**18**	16%
1600-1959	4	3	0	2	3	3	3	**18**	16%
2000-2359	6	0	2	1	1	11	0	**21**	19%
Total	**19**	**11**	**6**	**12**	**12**	**42**	**9**	**111**	100%
Percentage	17%	10%	5%	11%	11%	38%	8%	**100%**	

Southern District
(Company B)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2025

White males accounted for approximately 30% of arrests made by Southern Station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Company B
Race and Gender	Q1 2025 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	11	1%
Asian Male	35	3%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	74	6%
Black Male	298	26%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	36	3%
Hispanic Male	182	16%
Hispanic Unknown	3	0%
White Female	119	10%
White Male	342	30%
White Unknown	3	0%
Unknown Female	6	1%
Unknown Male	29	3%
Unknown Race & Gender	8	1%
Total	**1,146**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Southern District
(Company B)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2025

Individuals 30-39 accounted for 41% of arrests made by Southern Station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrest By Age		Company B
Age	**Q1 2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Under 18	14	1%
18-29	229	20%
30-39	468	41%
40-49	260	23%
50-59	120	10%
60+	55	5%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**1,146**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.”

Bayview District
(Company C)
Use of Force
January – March 2025

There was a total of 49 Uses of Force in the Bayview district. Firearm Pointing (32) accounted for 65% of Type of Force used. The peak times for uses of force (16, 33%) were between 0000-0359hrs. and 1600-1959hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	0
ERIW	0
ERIW 40 mm	1
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	32
Impact Weapon	0
K-9 Bite	0
Other	0
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	7
SpikeStrips	7
Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	2
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**49**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
C - Bayview	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	2	2	0	10	0	0	2	**16**	33%
0400-0759	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	**5**	10%
0800-1159	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	**1**	2%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	**2**	4%
1600-1959	0	0	1	6	0	7	2	**16**	33%
2000-2359	0	0	1	0	3	4	1	**9**	18%
Total	**2**	**2**	**2**	**17**	**4**	**15**	**7**	**49**	100%
Percentage	4%	4%	4%	35%	8%	31%	14%	**100%**	

Bayview District (Company C)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2025

Black males accounted for 37% of arrests made by Bayview Station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Company C
Race and Gender	**Q1 2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Asian Female	5	2%
Asian Male	17	6%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	31	10%
Black Male	114	37%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	20	7%
Hispanic Male	74	24%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	8	3%
White Male	25	8%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	2	1%
Unknown Male	6	2%
Unknown Race & Gender	3	1%
Total	**305**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Bayview District
(Company C)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2025

Individuals age 18-29 accounted for 29% of the arrests made by Bayview station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrest By Age		Company C
Age	**Q1 2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Under 18	18	6%
18-29	88	29%
30-39	78	26%
40-49	61	20%
50-59	40	13%
60+	20	7%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**305**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Mission District

(Company D)
Use of Force
January – March 2025

There was a total of 59 Uses of Force in the Mission district. Firearm Pointing (34) accounted for 58% of Type of Force used. The peak time for uses of force (19, 32%) was between 1600-1959hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	1
ERIW	0
ERIW 40 mm	0
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	34
Impact Weapon	0
K-9 Bite	0
Other	0
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	16
SpikeStrips	6
Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	2
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**59**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
D - Mission	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	8	5	0	1	0	**14**	24%
0400-0759	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	**2**	3%
0800-1159	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	**4**	7%
1200-1559	0	3	0	2	2	3	3	**13**	22%
1600-1959	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	**19**	32%
2000-2359	0	0	2	0	1	4	0	**7**	12%
Total	**19**	**4**	**10**	**9**	**4**	**8**	**5**	**59**	100%
Percentage	32%	7%	17%	15%	7%	14%	8%	**100%**	

Mission District
(Company D)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2025

Hispanic males accounted for 32% of all arrests made by Mission station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Company D
Race and Gender	**Q1 2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Asian Female	6	1%
Asian Male	20	2%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	48	6%
Black Male	154	19%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	50	6%
Hispanic Male	253	32%
Hispanic Unknown	1	0%
White Female	55	7%
White Male	187	23%
White Unknown	2	0%
Unknown Female	6	1%
Unknown Male	17	2%
Unknown Race & Gender	3	0%
Total	**802**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Mission District
(Company D)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2025

Individuals age 30-39 accounted for 40% of the arrests made by Mission station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrest By Age		Company D
Age	**Q1 2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Under 18	15	2%
18-29	167	21%
30-39	317	40%
40-49	198	25%
50-59	71	9%
60+	34	4%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**802**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Northern District

(Company E)

Use of Force

January – March 2025

There was a total of 51 Uses of Force in the Northern district. Physical Control Hold/Take Down (21) accounted for 41% of Type of Force used. The peak time for uses of force (22, 43%) was between 2000-2359hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	0
ERIW	0
ERIW 40 mm	0
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	16
Impact Weapon	1
K-9 Bite	0
Other	0
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	21
SpikeStrips	7
Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	6
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**51**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
E - Northern	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	**5**	10%
0400-0759	1	0	1	5	0	0	0	**7**	14%
0800-1159	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	**4**	8%
1200-1559	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	**4**	8%
1600-1959	1	0	4	2	1	1	0	**9**	18%
2000-2359	11	3	3	1	0	3	1	**22**	43%
Total	**20**	**4**	**8**	**8**	**1**	**9**	**1**	**51**	100%
Percentage	39%	8%	16%	16%	2%	18%	2%	**100%**	

Northern District
(Company E)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2025

White males accounted for 38% of all arrests made by Northern Station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Company E
Race and Gender	**Q1 2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Asian Female	1	0%
Asian Male	20	5%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	21	5%
Black Male	88	21%
Black Unknown	1	0%
Hispanic Female	10	2%
Hispanic Male	57	14%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	48	11%
White Male	159	38%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	1	0%
Unknown Male	11	3%
Unknown Race & Gender	2	0%
Total	**419**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Northern District
(Company E)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2025

Individuals ages 30-39 accounted for 37% of arrests made by Northern station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrest By Age		Company E
Age	**Q1 2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Under 18	5	1%
18-29	85	20%
30-39	155	37%
40-49	110	26%
50-59	47	11%
60+	17	4%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**419**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.”

Park District
(Company F)
Use of Force
January – March 2025

There was a total of 9 Uses of Force in the Park district. Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist) (3) accounted for 33% of Type of Force used. The peak time for uses of force (6, 67%) was between 0800-1159hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	0
ERIW	2
ERIW 40 mm	1
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	1
Impact Weapon	0
K-9 Bite	0
Other	0
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	2
SpikeStrips	0
Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	3
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**9**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
F - Park	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	**1**	11%
0400-0759	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
0800-1159	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	**6**	67%
1200-1559	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**1**	11%
1600-1959	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**1**	11%
2000-2359	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
Total	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**6**	**0**	**1**	**9**	100%
Percentage	0%	0%	11%	11%	67%	0%	11%	**100%**	

Park District
(Company F)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2025

Black males (24%) and White males (34%) accounted for 58% of all arrests made by Park Station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Company F
Race and Gender	Q1 2025 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	1	1%
Asian Male	3	3%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	3	3%
Black Male	21	21%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	3	3%
Hispanic Male	12	12%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	9	9%
White Male	47	47%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	0	0%
Unknown Male	1	1%
Unknown Race & Gender	0	0%
Total	**100**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Park District
(Company F)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2025

Individuals age 30-39 accounted for 46% of the arrests made by Park station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrest By Age		Company F
Age	**Q1 2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Under 18	6	6%
18-29	23	23%
30-39	28	28%
40-49	22	22%
50-59	13	13%
60+	8	8%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**100**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.”

Richmond District
(Company G)
Use of Force
January – March 2025

There was a total of 11 Uses of Force in the Richmond district. Firearm Pointing (6) accounted for 55% of Type of Force used. The peak time for uses of force (6, 55%) was between 1200-1559hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	0
ERIW	0
ERIW 40 mm	0
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	6
Impact Weapon	0
K-9 Bite	0
Other	0
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	2
SpikeStrips	3
Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	0
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**11**

Time of Day/Day of Week G - Richmond	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	**2**	18%
0400-0759	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
0800-1159	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	**1**	9%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	**6**	55%
1600-1959	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
2000-2359	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	**2**	18%
Total	**1**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**4**	**3**	**1**	**11**	100%
Percentage	9%	0%	0%	18%	36%	27%	9%	**100%**	

Richmond District
(Company G)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2025

White males accounted for 29% of all arrests made by Richmond station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Company G
Race and Gender	**Q1 2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Asian Female	2	2%
Asian Male	8	8%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	4	4%
Black Male	22	22%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	5	5%
Hispanic Male	15	15%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	14	14%
White Male	25	25%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	0	0%
Unknown Male	3	3%
Unknown Race & Gender	1	1%
Total	**99**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Richmond District
(Company G)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2025

Individuals aged 40-49 accounted for 28% of the arrests made by Richmond station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrest By Age		Company G
Age	**Q1 2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Under 18	7	7%
18-29	21	21%
30-39	26	26%
40-49	28	28%
50-59	13	13%
60+	4	4%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**99**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.”

Ingleside District
(Company H)
Use of Force
January – March 2025

There was a total of 50 Uses of Force in the Ingleside district. Firearm Pointing (24) accounted for 48% of Type of Force used. The peak time for uses of force (20, 40%) was between 2000-2359hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	0
ERIW	1
ERIW 40 mm	1
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	24
Impact Weapon	0
K-9 Bite	0
Other	4
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	13
SpikeStrips	3
Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	3
Vehicle Intervention	1
Grand Total	**50**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
H - Ingleside	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	**3**	6%
0400-0759	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	**2**	4%
0800-1159	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	**3**	6%
1200-1559	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	**6**	12%
1600-1959	0	0	0	1	5	10	0	**16**	32%
2000-2359	4	5	4	0	5	2	0	**20**	40%
Total	**5**	**6**	**5**	**5**	**15**	**14**	**0**	**50**	100%
Percentage	10%	12%	10%	10%	30%	28%	0%	**100%**	

Ingleside District
(Company H)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2025

Hispanic males accounted for 26% of all arrests made by Ingleside station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender	Company H	
Race and Gender	Q1 2025 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	9	4%
Asian Male	18	7%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	22	9%
Black Male	54	22%
Black Unknown	1	0%
Hispanic Female	15	6%
Hispanic Male	63	26%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	19	8%
White Male	42	17%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	1	0%
Unknown Male	1	0%
Unknown Race & Gender	0	0%
Total	**245**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Ingleside District
(Company H)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2025

Individuals age 30-39 accounted for 32% of arrests made by the Ingleside station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrest By Age		Company H
Age	**Q1 2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Under 18	8	3%
18-29	69	28%
30-39	78	32%
40-49	46	19%
50-59	33	13%
60+	11	4%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**245**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Taraval District
(Company I)
Use of Force
January - March 2025

There was a total of 39 Uses of Force in the Taraval district. Firearm Pointing (22) accounted for 56% of Type of Force used. The peak time for uses of force (19, 49%) was between 1600-1959hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	1
ERIW	0
ERIW 40 mm	0
Firearm OIS	1
Firearm Pointing	22
Impact Weapon	0
K-9 Bite	0
Other	3
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	7
SpikeStrips	2
Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	3
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**39**

Time of Day/Day of Week I - Taraval	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	**6**	15%
0400-0759	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
0800-1159	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	**3**	8%
1200-1559	2	0	0	3	3	0	0	**8**	21%
1600-1959	0	0	0	9	1	0	9	**19**	49%
2000-2359	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	**3**	8%
Total	**2**	**4**	**1**	**15**	**7**	**1**	**9**	**39**	100%
Percentage	5%	10%	3%	38%	18%	3%	23%	**100%**	

Taraval District
(Company I)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2025

Hispanic accounted for 22% of all arrests made by Taraval station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Company I
Race and Gender	Q1 2025 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	6	3%
Asian Male	30	16%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	19	10%
Black Male	25	14%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	11	6%
Hispanic Male	41	22%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	12	7%
White Male	33	18%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	1	1%
Unknown Male	4	2%
Unknown Race & Gender	1	1%
Total	**183**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Taraval District
(Company I)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2025

Individuals ages 30-39 accounted for 36% of arrests made by Taraval station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrest By Age		Company I
Age	Q1 2025 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	6	3%
18-29	53	29%
30-39	65	36%
40-49	29	16%
50-59	15	8%
60+	15	8%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**183**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Tenderloin District

(Company J)
Use of Force
January – March 2025

There was a total of 71 Uses of Force in the Tenderloin district. Firearm pointing (29) accounted for 41% of Type of Force used. The peak times for uses of force (20, 28%) were between 1200-1559hrs and 2000-2359hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	3
ERIW	1
ERIW 40 mm	1
Firearm OIS	1
Firearm Pointing	29
Impact Weapon	0
K-9 Bite	0
Other	6
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	22
SpikeStrips	5
Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	2
Vehicle Intervention	1
Grand Total	**71**

Time of Day/Day of Week J - Tenderloin	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	4	2	6	0	0	0	**12**	17%
0400-0759	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**1**	1%
0800-1159	0	2	2	0	6	0	0	**10**	14%
1200-1559	0	2	1	2	8	4	3	**20**	28%
1600-1959	1	0	3	1	0	1	2	**8**	11%
2000-2359	0	9	2	5	2	0	2	**20**	28%
Total	**1**	**17**	**10**	**14**	**16**	**5**	**8**	**71**	100%
Percentage	1%	24%	14%	20%	23%	7%	11%	**100%**	

Tenderloin District
(Company J)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2025

Black males (29%) and White males (24%) accounted for 53% of all arrests made by Tenderloin Station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Company J
Race and Gender	**Q1 2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Asian Female	4	0%
Asian Male	41	4%
Asian Unknown	1	0%
Black Female	70	7%
Black Male	284	29%
Black Unknown	3	0%
Hispanic Female	26	3%
Hispanic Male	200	21%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	67	7%
White Male	234	24%
White Unknown	4	0%
Unknown Female	6	1%
Unknown Male	31	3%
Unknown Race & Gender	2	0%
Total	**973**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Tenderloin District
(Company J)
Arrests Age
January – March 2025

Individuals age 30-39 accounted for 37% of arrests made by Tenderloin station in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Arrest By Age		Company J
Age	**Q1 2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Under 18	20	2%
18-29	230	24%
30-39	356	37%
40-49	231	24%
50-59	85	9%
60+	51	5%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**973**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Airport

Use of Force
January – March 2025

There was a total of 1 Use of Force in the Airport district. Chemical Agent (1) accounted for 100% of Type of Force used. The peak time for uses of force (1, 100%) was between 2000-2359hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	1
ERIW	0
ERIW 40 mm	0
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	0
Impact Weapon	0
K-9 Bite	0
Other	0
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	0
SpikeStrips	0
Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	0
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**1**

Time of Day/Day of Week K - Airport	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
0400-0759	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
0800-1159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1600-1959	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
2000-2359	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	**1**	100%
Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	100%
Percentage	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	**100%**	

Airport
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2025

White males accounted for 19% of total Airport arrests in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Airport Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		
Race & Gender	Q1-2025 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	4	4%
Asian Male	19	17%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	8	7%
Black Male	16	15%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	4	4%
Hispanic Male	9	8%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	9	8%
White Male	21	19%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	2	2%
Unknown Male	18	100%
Total	**110**	**100%**



Note: Airport arrest data is obtained from the San Francisco Police Department's Airport Bureau. Airport data includes every individual arrest (booked or cited) that occurs within 24-hour periods in the 3-month quarterly time period. An individual arrested within different 24-hour periods are counted as separate arrests. Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided. Arrests made by Department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

Airport
Arrests by Age
January – March 2025

Individuals age 30-39 accounted for 34% of all Airport arrests in Quarter 1 of 2025.

Airport Arrests by Age		
Group	**Q1-2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
18-29	11	10%
30-39	37	34%
40-49	23	21%
50-59	24	22%
60+	15	14%
Total	**110**	**100%**



Note: Airport arrest data is obtained from the San Francisco Police Department's Airport Bureau. Airport data includes every individual arrest (booked or cited) that occurs within 24-hour periods in the 3-month quarterly time period. An individual arrested within different 24-hour periods are counted as separate arrests. Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided. Arrests made by Department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

Outside of SF/Unknown

Use of Force
January – March 2025

There was a total of 28 Uses of Force Outside of SF/Unknown. Firearm Pointing (23) accounted for 82% of Type of Force used. The peak time for uses of force (17, 61%) was between 1200-1559hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	0
ERIW	0
ERIW 40 mm	0
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	23
Impact Weapon	0
K-9 Bite	0
Other	4
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	0
SpikeStrips	0
Strike by Object (Personal Body Weapon/Fist)	0
Vehicle Intervention	1
Grand Total	**28**

Time of Day/Day of Week L - Outside SF	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	**6**	21%
0400-0759	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
0800-1159	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**1**	4%
1200-1559	0	0	2	0	14	1	0	**17**	61%
1600-1959	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**2**	7%
2000-2359	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	**2**	7%
Total	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**14**	**3**	**6**	**28**	100%
Percentage	0%	0%	18%	0%	50%	11%	21%	**100%**	

Outside SF/Unknown
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2025

Black males (19) accounted for 37% of all Outside SF arrests.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Company X
Race and Gender	**Q1 2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Asian Female	0	0%
Asian Male	4	6%
Asian Unknown	1	2%
Black Female	12	19%
Black Male	19	30%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	4	6%
Hispanic Male	14	22%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	2	3%
White Male	3	5%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	0	0%
Unknown Male	1	2%
Unknown Race & Gender	4	6%
Total	**64**	**100%**



Note: Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided. Arrests made by Department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

Outside SF/Unknown
Arrests by Age
January – March 2025

Individuals age 18-29 accounted for 48% of all Outside SF arrests.

Arrest By Age		Company X
Age	**Q1 2025 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Under 18	2	3%
18-29	31	48%
30-39	18	28%
40-49	5	8%
50-59	5	8%
60+	3	5%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**64**	**100%**



Note: Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria include results in which "Person Type" = "Booked" or "Cited." Arrests made by Department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

Outside SF/Unknown
Arrests by Location
January – March 2025

Oakland, CA (7) and Daly City, CA (6) accounted for 13 of 43 arrests outside of the city limits.

Arrests Outside of SF by Location	
Location	**2025 Q1 Arrests**
Antioch, CA	1
Chicago, IL	1
Confidential	2
Cotati, CA	1
Daly City PD	1
Daly City, CA	5
Denver, CO	2
East Palo Alto, CA	1
Gridley, CA	1
Indian Springs, NV	1
Kinman, AZ	1
Las Vegaas, NV	1
Minden, NV	2
Newark, CA	1
Oakland, CA	8
Oberlin, LA	1
Orlando, FL	1
Pittsburg, CA	8
Placerville, CA	2
Redwood City, CA	1
Rohnert Park, CA	1
San Bruno, CA	3
San Jose, CA	1
San Leandro, CA	3
San Lorenzo, CA	1
San Mateo, CA	2
Seattle, WA	1
SF County (Non-SFPD Jurisdiction)	2
South San Francisco, CA	1
Union City, CA	6
Vallejo, CA	1
Grand Total	**64**



Glossary

Note: Arrests made by Department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

AB 953	Assembly Bill 953, also known as the Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) of 2015; requires CA law enforcement agencies to collect and report demographic data to the California Department of Justice
ACS	American Community Survey
Benchmark	Benchmark Stop Data System, the tool used to collect stops and search data in compliance with AB953 beginning June 28, 2023, 1200hrs.
CDW	Crime Data Warehouse
City	City and County of San Francisco
Department	San Francisco Police Department
DGO	Department General Order
DHR	San Francisco Department of Human Resources
DHS	U.S. Department of Homeland Security
DOJ	U.S. Department of Justice
DPA	Department of Police Accountability
EEO	Equal Employment Opportunity
PRCS	Post Release Community Supervision; used to classify probation and parole searches.
RIPA Board	California's Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board; produces an annual report on the past and status of racial identity profiling and provides recommendations to law enforcement agencies.
SDCS	Stop Data Collection System, the tool used to collect stops and search data in compliance with AB953 from 2018 through June 28, 2023, 1159hrs.
SFPD	San Francisco Police Department
TSA	Transportation Security Administration
UoF	Use of Force

Safety with Respect

Prepared by San Francisco Police Department

Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit
June 2025

Data Sources: San Francisco Police Department's Crime Data Warehouse, accessed via Business Intelligence Tools; San Francisco Police Department Early Intervention Systems Administrative Investigative Management Database, accessed via Business Intelligence Tools; San Francisco Police Department Airport Bureau, San Francisco Police Department Human Resources; San Francisco Police Department Internal Affairs; San Francisco Department of Emergency Management; San Francisco Department of Police Accountability; California Department of Justice Stop Data Collection System

Q1 2025 Stops data was uploaded to DataSF on June 23, 2025
Q1 2025 Use of Force data was queried on May 7, 2025
Q1 2025 Arrest Data was queried on June 27, 2025

Safety with Respect

APPENDIX A
SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report
2025 Quarter 1 Report
Crime Victim Data Reporting

PAUL YEP
Chief of Police

On April 12, 2020, Ordinance 40-20 went into effect, amending San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 96 to include section 96A.5, "Quarterly Crime Victim Data Reporting." The ordinance mandated that the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) provide quarterly reports regarding victim demographics across a host of data points, further specifying that the quarterly reports would be due on the first Tuesday in February, May, August and November.

As part of our commitment to the community we serve, SFPD's Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit worked diligently and in close coordination with relevant SFPD bureaus to compile the crime victim information required for this report. It bears mentioning here, however, that as noted by the Board of Supervisors' Budget and Legislative Analyst, SFPD…

> …would need to modify the current UCR [Uniform Crime Reports] system if the proposed ordinance required tracking and reporting of the additional crime data at an earlier date than the estimated NIBRS [National Incident-Based Reporting System] implementation date of March 2022. Based on a minimum of two full-time equivalent (FTE) consultants, the Department estimates the minimum cost would be approximately $960,000. The estimated cost could be higher, based on the actual scope of work needed to modify the current UCR system. (Source: Budget and Legislative Analyst Memo for the February 6, 2020 Government Audit and Oversight Committee Meeting, Feb. 3, 2020, https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8048232&GUID=24920980-EBBA-4951-95B0-79C2FB993568)

As no additional funding was allocated to allow for the extraction of this data from our primary records management system, Crime Data Warehouse (CDW), staff worked within the constraints of the current resources to aggregate the needed data from CDW as it stands. As a result, readers must be aware that SFPD data is not structured for this reporting method.

As background, all law enforcement agencies must report the most severe crime under the Uniform Crime Reporting requirements, as stated by the FBI Summary Reporting System manual:

"*In cases where more than one offense occurs in an incident, only the highest ranking Part I offense is counted.*"

This "hierarchy rule" has led to the development of a system (born many decades ago), and migrated to the current state, structured for the purpose of counting the "highest ranking" offense. As such, the number of victims of certain crimes is not mandated for reporting by UCR nor is the age, ethnicity, gender or location for any crime. Therefore, detailed demographic and location information for victims is not prepared for capture in this type of report.

For example:

1. An individual can be a victim of multiple crime types in a single reported incident – that person may be counted in each crime type.
2. In a single incident with multiple crimes *and* multiple victims, SFPD summary reporting cannot provide how many people were victim to any individual crime. All victims in the incident show up in each crime.

Prepared by: San Francisco Police Department Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit
Data Sources: San Francisco Police Department's Crime Data Warehouse (CDW); San Francisco Police Department Homicide Unit; San Francisco Police Department Special Investigations Division

APPENDIX A – SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report - Victim Demographic Summary Findings

Aggravated Assault
The number of victims associated with Aggravated Assault incident reports is down 3 percent from Q1 2024 to Q1 2025. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Aggravated Assault in Q1 2025 are Hispanic, males, ages 30-39.

Battery/Other Assault
The number of victims associated with Battery/Other Assault incident reports is down 9.7 percent from Q1 2024 to Q1 2025. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Battery/Other Assault in Q1 2025 are Hispanic or Latin, males, ages 30-39.

Robbery
The number of victims associated with Robbery incident reports is down 23 percent from Q1 2024 to Q1 2025. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Robbery in Q1 2025 are Hispanic, males, ages 18-29.

Burglary
The number of victims associated with Burglary incident reports is down 22.5 percent from Q1 2024 to Q1 2025. Burglary victim data includes commercial establishments, which are typically entered in the “other” and “unknown” demographic categories. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Burglary in Q1 2025, excluding others and unknown, are White, males, ages 30-39.

Larceny Theft
The number of victims associated with Larceny incident reports is down 34.5 percent from Q1 2024 to Q1 2025. Larceny victim data includes commercial establishments, which are typically entered in the “other” and “unknown” demographic categories. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Larceny in Q1 2025 are other/unknown, followed by White, male, ages 30-39.

Motor Vehicle Theft
The number of victims associated with Motor Vehicle Theft incident reports is down 39.5 percent from Q1 2024 to Q1 2025. Motor Vehicle Theft victim data includes commercial establishments, which are typically entered in the “other” and “unknown” demographic categories. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Motor Vehicle Theft in Q1 2025 are others, followed by white, male, ages 30-39.

Sexual Assault
The number of victims associated with Sexual Assault incident reports is up 18.5 percent from Q1 2024 to Q1 2025. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Sexual Assault in Q1 2025 are White, females, ages 18-29.

Vandalism
The number of victims associated with Vandalism incident reports is down 26.6 percent from Q1 2024 to Q1 2025. Vandalism victim data includes commercial establishments, which are typically entered in the “other” and “unknown” demographic categories. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Vandalism in Q1 2025 are others, followed by White, male, ages 30-39.

VICTIM DEMOGRAPHIC DATA REPORT
Q1 2025

Domestic Violence
The number of victims associated with Domestic Violence incident reports is up 5.3 percent from Q1 2024 to Q1 2025. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Domestic Violence in Q1 2025 are Hispanic, female, ages 30-39.

Elder Abuse
The number of victims associated with Elder Abuse incident reports is down 6.3 percent from Q1 2024 to Q1 2025. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Elder Abuse in Q1 2025 are White, males, ages 65 or older.

Child Abuse
The number of victims associated with Child Abuse incident reports is down7 percent from Q1 2024 to Q1 2025. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Child Abuse in Q1 2025 are Black, female, under 18 years old.

Homicide
The number of Homicide victims is down 50 percent from Q1 2024 to Q1 2025. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Homicide in Q1 2025 are Black, males, age 30-39.

Hate Crime
The number of victims associated with Hate Crime incident reports is up 6.7 percent from Q1 2024 to Q1 2025. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Hate Crime in Q1 2025 are Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian, male, ages 60 and over. The most prevalent bias motivation during Q1 2025 was Sexual Orientation.

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2025

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	2.00	9.00	9.00	21.00	5.00	2.00	17.00	**65.00**
B	Southern		14.00	31.00	42.00	17.00	7.00	46.00	**157.00**
C	Bayview	1.00	12.00	46.00	37.00	6.00		19.00	**121.00**
D	Mission		3.00	23.00	71.00	17.00	6.00	32.00	**152.00**
E	Northern		11.00	30.00	15.00	11.00	2.00	22.00	**91.00**
F	Park		2.00	4.00	5.00	1.00	4.00	14.00	**30.00**
G	Richmond		3.00	2.00	2.00	4.00		11.00	**22.00**
H	Ingleside		9.00	15.00	37.00	6.00	8.00	6.00	**81.00**
I	Taraval	1.00	11.00	9.00	11.00	2.00	2.00	15.00	**51.00**
J	Tenderloin	3.00	10.00	42.00	21.00	7.00	6.00	30.00	**119.00**
Grand Total		**7.00**	**84.00**	**211.00**	**262.00**	**76.00**	**37.00**	**212.00**	**889.00**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	0.2%	1.0%	1.0%	2.4%	0.6%	0.2%	1.9%	**7.3%**
B	Southern		1.6%	3.5%	4.7%	1.9%	0.8%	5.2%	**17.7%**
C	Bayview	0.1%	1.3%	5.2%	4.2%	0.7%		2.1%	**13.6%**
D	Mission		0.3%	2.6%	8.0%	1.9%	0.7%	3.6%	**17.1%**
E	Northern		1.2%	3.4%	1.7%	1.2%	0.2%	2.5%	**10.2%**
F	Park		0.2%	0.4%	0.6%	0.1%	0.4%	1.6%	**3.4%**
G	Richmond		0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%		1.2%	**2.5%**
H	Ingleside		1.0%	1.7%	4.2%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	**9.1%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	1.2%	1.0%	1.2%	0.2%	0.2%	1.7%	**5.7%**
J	Tenderloin	0.3%	1.1%	4.7%	2.4%	0.8%	0.7%	3.4%	**13.4%**
Grand Total		**0.8%**	**9.4%**	**23.7%**	**29.5%**	**8.5%**	**4.2%**	**23.8%**	**100.0%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	2.00	17.00	13.00	12.00	6.00	8.00	7.00	**65.00**
B	Southern	4.00	35.00	45.00	18.00	11.00	18.00	26.00	**157.00**
C	Bayview	19.00	21.00	33.00	19.00	15.00	9.00	5.00	**121.00**
D	Mission	7.00	29.00	34.00	26.00	21.00	17.00	18.00	**152.00**
E	Northern	3.00	23.00	21.00	11.00	10.00	12.00	11.00	**91.00**
F	Park		2.00	9.00	6.00	1.00	8.00	4.00	**30.00**
G	Richmond	3.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	**22.00**
H	Ingleside	18.00	13.00	15.00	9.00	9.00	4.00	13.00	**81.00**
I	Taraval	4.00	15.00	15.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	5.00	**51.00**
J	Tenderloin	3.00	23.00	27.00	26.00	9.00	20.00	11.00	**119.00**
Grand Total		**63.00**	**183.00**	**216.00**	**134.00**	**90.00**	**100.00**	**103.00**	**889.00**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.2%	1.9%	1.5%	1.3%	0.7%	0.9%	0.8%	**7.3%**
B	Southern	0.4%	3.9%	5.1%	2.0%	1.2%	2.0%	2.9%	**17.7%**
C	Bayview	2.1%	2.4%	3.7%	2.1%	1.7%	1.0%	0.6%	**13.6%**
D	Mission	0.8%	3.3%	3.8%	2.9%	2.4%	1.9%	2.0%	**17.1%**
E	Northern	0.3%	2.6%	2.4%	1.2%	1.1%	1.3%	1.2%	**10.2%**
F	Park		0.2%	1.0%	0.7%	0.1%	0.9%	0.4%	**3.4%**
G	Richmond	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	**2.5%**
H	Ingleside	2.0%	1.5%	1.7%	1.0%	1.0%	0.4%	1.5%	**9.1%**
I	Taraval	0.4%	1.7%	1.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.2%	0.6%	**5.7%**
J	Tenderloin	0.3%	2.6%	3.0%	2.9%	1.0%	2.2%	1.2%	**13.4%**
Grand Total		**7.1%**	**20.6%**	**24.3%**	**15.1%**	**10.1%**	**11.2%**	**11.6%**	**100.0%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	19.00	40.00	6.00		**65.00**
B	Southern	52.00	84.00	18.00	3.00	**157.00**
C	Bayview	48.00	69.00	4.00		**121.00**
D	Mission	46.00	89.00	17.00		**152.00**
E	Northern	32.00	49.00	10.00		**91.00**
F	Park	10.00	18.00	1.00	1.00	**30.00**
G	Richmond	6.00	13.00	3.00		**22.00**
H	Ingleside	31.00	45.00	5.00		**81.00**
I	Taraval	23.00	26.00	2.00		**51.00**
J	Tenderloin	35.00	76.00	8.00		**119.00**
Grand Total		**302.00**	**509.00**	**74.00**	**4.00**	**889.00**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	2.1%	4.5%	0.7%		**7.3%**
B	Southern	5.8%	9.4%	2.0%	0.3%	**17.7%**
C	Bayview	5.4%	7.8%	0.4%		**13.6%**
D	Mission	5.2%	10.0%	1.9%		**17.1%**
E	Northern	3.6%	5.5%	1.1%		**10.2%**
F	Park	1.1%	2.0%	0.1%	0.1%	**3.4%**
G	Richmond	0.7%	1.5%	0.3%		**2.5%**
H	Ingleside	3.5%	5.1%	0.6%		**9.1%**
I	Taraval	2.6%	2.9%	0.2%		**5.7%**
J	Tenderloin	3.9%	8.5%	0.9%		**13.4%**
Grand Total		**34.0%**	**57.3%**	**8.3%**	**0.4%**	**100.0%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2024	2	97	194	286	72	36	205	**892**
Q1 2025	7	84	211	262	76	37	212	**889**
Difference	5	-13	17	-24	4	1	7	**-3**
% Change	**250.0%**	**-13.4%**	**8.8%**	**-8.4%**	**5.6%**	**2.8%**	**3.4%**	**-0.3%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2024	52	183	218	151	105	100	83	**892**
Q1 2025	63	183	216	134	90	100	103	**889**
Difference	11	0	-2	-17	-15	0	20	**-3**
% Change	**21.2%**	**0.0%**	**-0.9%**	**-11.3%**	**-14.3%**	**0.0%**	**24.1%**	**-0.3%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2024	260	559	3	70		**892**
Q1 2025	302	509		74	4	**889**
Difference	42	-50	-3	4	4	**-3**
% Change	**16.2%**	**-8.9%**	**-100.0%**	**5.7%**	**not calc**	**-0.3%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2025

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	4.00	32.00	18.00	36.00	10.00	9.00	51.00	**160.00**
B	Southern	3.00	21.00	54.00	61.00	19.00	19.00	80.00	**257.00**
C	Bayview		9.00	50.00	54.00	9.00	5.00	17.00	**144.00**
D	Mission	4.00	22.00	36.00	97.00	15.00	10.00	38.00	**222.00**
E	Northern	3.00	22.00	43.00	49.00	11.00	10.00	63.00	**201.00**
F	Park		4.00	2.00	4.00	1.00	3.00	25.00	**39.00**
G	Richmond		9.00	5.00	6.00	2.00	1.00	21.00	**44.00**
H	Ingleside		15.00	28.00	50.00	3.00	2.00	20.00	**118.00**
I	Taraval		18.00	10.00	18.00	6.00	1.00	30.00	**83.00**
J	Tenderloin		17.00	47.00	28.00	10.00	13.00	53.00	**168.00**
X	Out of SF			2.00					**2.00**
Grand Total		**14.00**	**169.00**	**295.00**	**403.00**	**86.00**	**73.00**	**398.00**	**1438.00**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	0.3%	2.2%	1.3%	2.5%	0.7%	0.6%	3.5%	**11.1%**
B	Southern	0.2%	1.5%	3.8%	4.2%	1.3%	1.3%	5.6%	**17.9%**
C	Bayview		0.6%	3.5%	3.8%	0.6%	0.3%	1.2%	**10.0%**
D	Mission	0.3%	1.5%	2.5%	6.7%	1.0%	0.7%	2.6%	**15.4%**
E	Northern	0.2%	1.5%	3.0%	3.4%	0.8%	0.7%	4.4%	**14.0%**
F	Park		0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	1.7%	**2.7%**
G	Richmond		0.6%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	1.5%	**3.1%**
H	Ingleside		1.0%	1.9%	3.5%	0.2%	0.1%	1.4%	**8.2%**
I	Taraval		1.3%	0.7%	1.3%	0.4%	0.1%	2.1%	**5.8%**
J	Tenderloin		1.2%	3.3%	1.9%	0.7%	0.9%	3.7%	**11.7%**
X	Out of SF			0.1%					**0.1%**
Grand Total		**1.0%**	**11.8%**	**20.5%**	**28.0%**	**6.0%**	**5.1%**	**27.7%**	**100.0%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	6.00	40.00	37.00	26.00	22.00	17.00	12.00	**160.00**
B	Southern	12.00	50.00	64.00	48.00	37.00	24.00	22.00	**257.00**
C	Bayview	21.00	36.00	21.00	27.00	11.00	21.00	7.00	**144.00**
D	Mission	10.00	47.00	57.00	36.00	26.00	23.00	23.00	**222.00**
E	Northern	12.00	53.00	43.00	35.00	22.00	24.00	12.00	**201.00**
F	Park		10.00	10.00	3.00	10.00	3.00	3.00	**39.00**
G	Richmond	6.00	8.00	9.00	5.00	9.00	6.00	1.00	**44.00**
H	Ingleside	13.00	23.00	26.00	19.00	16.00	18.00	3.00	**118.00**
I	Taraval	8.00	22.00	20.00	8.00	8.00	13.00	4.00	**83.00**
J	Tenderloin	8.00	27.00	49.00	30.00	16.00	25.00	13.00	**168.00**
X	Out of SF			1.00	1.00				**2.00**
Grand Total		**96.00**	**316.00**	**337.00**	**238.00**	**177.00**	**174.00**	**100.00**	**1438.00**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.4%	2.8%	2.6%	1.8%	1.5%	1.2%	0.8%	**11.1%**
B	Southern	0.8%	3.5%	4.5%	3.3%	2.6%	1.7%	1.5%	**17.9%**
C	Bayview	1.5%	2.5%	1.5%	1.9%	0.8%	1.5%	0.5%	**10.0%**
D	Mission	0.7%	3.3%	4.0%	2.5%	1.8%	1.6%	1.6%	**15.4%**
E	Northern	0.8%	3.7%	3.0%	2.4%	1.5%	1.7%	0.8%	**14.0%**
F	Park		0.7%	0.7%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	**2.7%**
G	Richmond	0.4%	0.6%	0.6%	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%	**3.1%**
H	Ingleside	0.9%	1.6%	1.8%	1.3%	1.1%	1.3%	0.2%	**8.2%**
I	Taraval	0.6%	1.5%	1.4%	0.6%	0.6%	0.9%	0.3%	**5.8%**
J	Tenderloin	0.6%	1.9%	3.4%	2.1%	1.1%	1.7%	0.9%	**11.7%**
X	Out of SF			0.1%	0.1%				**0.1%**
Grand Total		**6.7%**	**22.0%**	**23.4%**	**16.6%**	**12.3%**	**12.1%**	**7.0%**	**100.0%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	55.00	96.00		9.00		**160.00**
B	Southern	108.00	130.00		18.00	1.00	**257.00**
C	Bayview	73.00	64.00		7.00		**144.00**
D	Mission	91.00	116.00	1.00	14.00		**222.00**
E	Northern	88.00	105.00		8.00		**201.00**
F	Park	16.00	22.00		1.00		**39.00**
G	Richmond	28.00	15.00		1.00		**44.00**
H	Ingleside	70.00	45.00		3.00		**118.00**
I	Taraval	35.00	43.00		5.00		**83.00**
J	Tenderloin	66.00	92.00	1.00	9.00		**168.00**
X	Out of SF	1.00	1.00				**2.00**
Grand Total		**631.00**	**729.00**	**2.00**	**75.00**	**1.00**	**1438.00**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	3.8%	6.7%		0.6%		**11.1%**
B	Southern	7.5%	9.0%		1.3%	0.1%	**17.9%**
C	Bayview	5.1%	4.5%		0.5%		**10.0%**
D	Mission	6.3%	8.1%	0.1%	1.0%		**15.4%**
E	Northern	6.1%	7.3%		0.6%		**14.0%**
F	Park	1.1%	1.5%		0.1%		**2.7%**
G	Richmond	1.9%	1.0%		0.1%		**3.1%**
H	Ingleside	4.9%	3.1%		0.2%		**8.2%**
I	Taraval	2.4%	3.0%		0.3%		**5.8%**
J	Tenderloin	4.6%	6.4%	0.1%	0.6%		**11.7%**
X	Out of SF	0.1%	0.1%				**0.1%**
Grand Total		**43.9%**	**50.7%**	**0.1%**	**5.2%**	**0.1%**	**100.0%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2024	12	200	323	454	113	57	434	**1,593**
Q1 2025	14	169	295	403	86	73	398	**1,438**
Difference	2	-31	-28	-51	-27	16	-36	**-155**
% Change	**16.7%**	**-15.5%**	**-8.7%**	**-11.2%**	**-23.9%**	**28.1%**	**-8.3%**	**-9.7%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2024	124	364	346	245	223	156	135	**1,593**
Q1 2025	96	316	337	238	177	174	100	**1,438**
Difference	-28	-48	-9	-7	-46	18	-35	**-155**
% Change	**-22.6%**	**-13.2%**	**-2.6%**	**-2.9%**	**-20.6%**	**11.5%**	**-25.9%**	**-9.7%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2024	662	816	6	108	1	**1,593**
Q1 2025	631	729	2	75	1	**1,438**
Difference	-31	-87	-4	-33	0	**-155**
% Change	**-4.7%**	**-10.7%**	**-66.7%**	**-30.6%**	**0.0%**	**-9.7%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2025

ROBBERY VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	3.00	21.00	9.00	28.00	27.00	7.00	21.00	**116.00**
B	Southern	2.00	9.00	16.00	21.00	12.00	6.00	18.00	**84.00**
C	Bayview		8.00	14.00	30.00	14.00		4.00	**70.00**
D	Mission		2.00	11.00	46.00	12.00	5.00	21.00	**97.00**
E	Northern		7.00	8.00	18.00	5.00		16.00	**54.00**
F	Park		2.00		1.00	2.00		4.00	**9.00**
G	Richmond		10.00		6.00	13.00	2.00	4.00	**35.00**
H	Ingleside	2.00	16.00	7.00	38.00	15.00		5.00	**83.00**
I	Taraval	1.00	14.00	3.00	5.00	6.00	1.00	10.00	**40.00**
J	Tenderloin		5.00	15.00	38.00	4.00	4.00	21.00	**87.00**
Grand Total		**8.00**	**94.00**	**83.00**	**231.00**	**110.00**	**25.00**	**124.00**	**675.00**

ROBBERY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	0.4%	3.1%	1.3%	4.1%	4.0%	1.0%	3.1%	**17.2%**
B	Southern	0.3%	1.3%	2.4%	3.1%	1.8%	0.9%	2.7%	**12.4%**
C	Bayview		1.2%	2.1%	4.4%	2.1%		0.6%	**10.4%**
D	Mission		0.3%	1.6%	6.8%	1.8%	0.7%	3.1%	**14.4%**
E	Northern		1.0%	1.2%	2.7%	0.7%		2.4%	**8.0%**
F	Park		0.3%		0.1%	0.3%		0.6%	**1.3%**
G	Richmond		1.5%		0.9%	1.9%	0.3%	0.6%	**5.2%**
H	Ingleside	0.3%	2.4%	1.0%	5.6%	2.2%		0.7%	**12.3%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	2.1%	0.4%	0.7%	0.9%	0.1%	1.5%	**5.9%**
J	Tenderloin		0.7%	2.2%	5.6%	0.6%	0.6%	3.1%	**12.9%**
Grand Total		**1.2%**	**13.9%**	**12.3%**	**34.2%**	**16.3%**	**3.7%**	**18.4%**	**100.0%**

ROBBERY VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	2.00	18.00	27.00	21.00	13.00	6.00	29.00	**116.00**
B	Southern		30.00	22.00	6.00		14.00	12.00	**84.00**
C	Bayview	11.00	14.00	17.00	9.00	3.00	4.00	12.00	**70.00**
D	Mission	5.00	18.00	16.00	21.00	12.00	9.00	16.00	**97.00**
E	Northern	1.00	22.00	13.00	7.00	6.00	1.00	4.00	**54.00**
F	Park			2.00		1.00	5.00	1.00	**9.00**
G	Richmond	1.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	6.00	3.00	13.00	**35.00**
H	Ingleside	13.00	29.00	4.00	5.00	11.00	7.00	14.00	**83.00**
I	Taraval	7.00	7.00	2.00	7.00		10.00	7.00	**40.00**
J	Tenderloin	3.00	18.00	33.00	15.00	5.00	8.00	5.00	**87.00**
Grand Total		**43.00**	**160.00**	**140.00**	**95.00**	**57.00**	**67.00**	**113.00**	**675.00**

ROBBERY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.3%	2.7%	4.0%	3.1%	1.9%	0.9%	4.3%	**17.2%**
B	Southern		4.4%	3.3%	0.9%		2.1%	1.8%	**12.4%**
C	Bayview	1.6%	2.1%	2.5%	1.3%	0.4%	0.6%	1.8%	**10.4%**
D	Mission	0.7%	2.7%	2.4%	3.1%	1.8%	1.3%	2.4%	**14.4%**
E	Northern	0.1%	3.3%	1.9%	1.0%	0.9%	0.1%	0.6%	**8.0%**
F	Park			0.3%		0.1%	0.7%	0.1%	**1.3%**
G	Richmond	0.1%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.9%	0.4%	1.9%	**5.2%**
H	Ingleside	1.9%	4.3%	0.6%	0.7%	1.6%	1.0%	2.1%	**12.3%**
I	Taraval	1.0%	1.0%	0.3%	1.0%		1.5%	1.0%	**5.9%**
J	Tenderloin	0.4%	2.7%	4.9%	2.2%	0.7%	1.2%	0.7%	**12.9%**
Grand Total		**6.4%**	**23.7%**	**20.7%**	**14.1%**	**8.4%**	**9.9%**	**16.7%**	**100.0%**

ROBBERY VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	36.00	52.00		28.00		**116.00**
B	Southern	20.00	51.00	1.00	12.00		**84.00**
C	Bayview	22.00	34.00		14.00		**70.00**
D	Mission	30.00	52.00		12.00	3.00	**97.00**
E	Northern	18.00	31.00		5.00		**54.00**
F	Park	2.00	5.00		2.00		**9.00**
G	Richmond	4.00	18.00		13.00		**35.00**
H	Ingleside	21.00	48.00		14.00		**83.00**
I	Taraval	18.00	16.00		6.00		**40.00**
J	Tenderloin	23.00	60.00		4.00		**87.00**
Grand Total		**194.00**	**367.00**	**1.00**	**110.00**	**3.00**	**675.00**

ROBBERY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	5.3%	7.7%		4.1%		**17.2%**
B	Southern	3.0%	7.6%	0.1%	1.8%		**12.4%**
C	Bayview	3.3%	5.0%		2.1%		**10.4%**
D	Mission	4.4%	7.7%		1.8%	0.4%	**14.4%**
E	Northern	2.7%	4.6%		0.7%		**8.0%**
F	Park	0.3%	0.7%		0.3%		**1.3%**
G	Richmond	0.6%	2.7%		1.9%		**5.2%**
H	Ingleside	3.1%	7.1%		2.1%		**12.3%**
I	Taraval	2.7%	2.4%		0.9%		**5.9%**
J	Tenderloin	3.4%	8.9%		0.6%		**12.9%**
Grand Total		**28.7%**	**54.4%**	**0.1%**	**16.3%**	**0.4%**	**100.0%**

ROBBERY - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

ROBBERY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2024	9	124	76	299	172	33	164	**877**
Q1 2025	8	94	83	231	110	25	124	**675**
Difference	-1	-30	7	-68	-62	-8	-40	**-202**
% Change	**-11.1%**	**-24.2%**	**9.2%**	**-22.7%**	**-36.0%**	**-24.2%**	**-24.4%**	**-23.0%**

ROBBERY - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

ROBBERY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2024	50	219	166	120	76	75	171	**877**
Q1 2025	43	160	140	95	57	67	113	**675**
Difference	-7	-59	-26	-25	-19	-8	-58	**-202**
% Change	**-14.0%**	**-26.9%**	**-15.7%**	**-20.8%**	**-25.0%**	**-10.7%**	**-33.9%**	**-23.0%**

ROBBERY - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

ROBBERY	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2024	196	508		171	2	**877**
Q1 2025	194	367	1	110	3	**675**
Difference	-2	-141	1	-61	1	**-202**
% Change	**-1.0%**	**-27.8%**	**not calc**	**-35.7%**	**50.0%**	**-23.0%**

BURGLARY VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	1.00	14.00	6.00	13.00	65.00	6.00	49.00	**154.00**
B	Southern	2.00	19.00	12.00	24.00	71.00	8.00	36.00	**172.00**
C	Bayview		20.00	22.00	13.00	49.00	4.00	31.00	**139.00**
D	Mission		23.00	3.00	27.00	93.00	8.00	71.00	**225.00**
E	Northern	1.00	22.00	8.00	7.00	83.00	17.00	76.00	**214.00**
F	Park		16.00	5.00	9.00	26.00	7.00	41.00	**104.00**
G	Richmond		23.00	2.00	10.00	48.00	8.00	71.00	**162.00**
H	Ingleside		33.00	4.00	22.00	25.00	2.00	32.00	**118.00**
I	Taraval		31.00	3.00	7.00	27.00	4.00	39.00	**111.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	5.00	11.00	8.00	14.00	5.00	8.00	**52.00**
X	Out of SF					9.00			**9.00**
Grand Total		**5.00**	**206.00**	**76.00**	**140.00**	**510.00**	**69.00**	**454.00**	**1460.00**

BURGLARY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	0.1%	1.0%	0.4%	0.9%	4.5%	0.4%	3.4%	**10.5%**
B	Southern	0.1%	1.3%	0.8%	1.6%	4.9%	0.5%	2.5%	**11.8%**
C	Bayview		1.4%	1.5%	0.9%	3.4%	0.3%	2.1%	**9.5%**
D	Mission		1.6%	0.2%	1.8%	6.4%	0.5%	4.9%	**15.4%**
E	Northern	0.1%	1.5%	0.5%	0.5%	5.7%	1.2%	5.2%	**14.7%**
F	Park		1.1%	0.3%	0.6%	1.8%	0.5%	2.8%	**7.1%**
G	Richmond		1.6%	0.1%	0.7%	3.3%	0.5%	4.9%	**11.1%**
H	Ingleside		2.3%	0.3%	1.5%	1.7%	0.1%	2.2%	**8.1%**
I	Taraval		2.1%	0.2%	0.5%	1.8%	0.3%	2.7%	**7.6%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	0.3%	0.8%	0.5%	1.0%	0.3%	0.5%	**3.6%**
X	Out of SF					0.6%			**0.6%**
Grand Total		**0.3%**	**14.1%**	**5.2%**	**9.6%**	**34.9%**	**4.7%**	**31.1%**	**100.0%**

BURGLARY VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central		13.00	29.00	11.00	15.00	21.00	65.00	**154.00**
B	Southern		11.00	39.00	27.00	18.00	9.00	68.00	**172.00**
C	Bayview	2.00	9.00	25.00	17.00	19.00	17.00	50.00	**139.00**
D	Mission	5.00	12.00	45.00	33.00	17.00	21.00	92.00	**225.00**
E	Northern		15.00	36.00	32.00	21.00	22.00	88.00	**214.00**
F	Park		13.00	21.00	15.00	18.00	15.00	22.00	**104.00**
G	Richmond	2.00	22.00	44.00	28.00	28.00	12.00	26.00	**162.00**
H	Ingleside	1.00	17.00	21.00	12.00	21.00	24.00	22.00	**118.00**
I	Taraval	5.00	6.00	19.00	21.00	17.00	23.00	20.00	**111.00**
J	Tenderloin	2.00	4.00	7.00	13.00	3.00	9.00	14.00	**52.00**
X	Out of SF							9.00	**9.00**
Grand Total		**17.00**	**122.00**	**286.00**	**209.00**	**177.00**	**173.00**	**476.00**	**1460.00**

BURGLARY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central		0.9%	2.0%	0.8%	1.0%	1.4%	4.5%	**10.5%**
B	Southern		0.8%	2.7%	1.8%	1.2%	0.6%	4.7%	**11.8%**
C	Bayview	0.1%	0.6%	1.7%	1.2%	1.3%	1.2%	3.4%	**9.5%**
D	Mission	0.3%	0.8%	3.1%	2.3%	1.2%	1.4%	6.3%	**15.4%**
E	Northern		1.0%	2.5%	2.2%	1.4%	1.5%	6.0%	**14.7%**
F	Park		0.9%	1.4%	1.0%	1.2%	1.0%	1.5%	**7.1%**
G	Richmond	0.1%	1.5%	3.0%	1.9%	1.9%	0.8%	1.8%	**11.1%**
H	Ingleside	0.1%	1.2%	1.4%	0.8%	1.4%	1.6%	1.5%	**8.1%**
I	Taraval	0.3%	0.4%	1.3%	1.4%	1.2%	1.6%	1.4%	**7.6%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.9%	0.2%	0.6%	1.0%	**3.6%**
X	Out of SF							0.6%	**0.6%**
Grand Total		**1.2%**	**8.4%**	**19.6%**	**14.3%**	**12.1%**	**11.8%**	**32.6%**	**100.0%**

BURGLARY VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	29.00	61.00		64.00		**154.00**
B	Southern	39.00	62.00	1.00	68.00	2.00	**172.00**
C	Bayview	40.00	51.00		48.00		**139.00**
D	Mission	44.00	95.00		85.00	1.00	**225.00**
E	Northern	50.00	79.00		76.00	9.00	**214.00**
F	Park	27.00	55.00		21.00	1.00	**104.00**
G	Richmond	56.00	75.00	1.00	30.00		**162.00**
H	Ingleside	37.00	60.00		21.00		**118.00**
I	Taraval	35.00	52.00		21.00	3.00	**111.00**
J	Tenderloin	19.00	19.00		14.00		**52.00**
X	Out of SF				9.00		**9.00**
Grand Total		**376.00**	**609.00**	**2.00**	**457.00**	**16.00**	**1460.00**

BURGLARY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	2.0%	4.2%		4.4%		**10.5%**
B	Southern	2.7%	4.2%	0.1%	4.7%	0.1%	**11.8%**
C	Bayview	2.7%	3.5%		3.3%		**9.5%**
D	Mission	3.0%	6.5%		5.8%	0.1%	**15.4%**
E	Northern	3.4%	5.4%		5.2%	0.6%	**14.7%**
F	Park	1.8%	3.8%		1.4%	0.1%	**7.1%**
G	Richmond	3.8%	5.1%	0.1%	2.1%		**11.1%**
H	Ingleside	2.5%	4.1%		1.4%		**8.1%**
I	Taraval	2.4%	3.6%		1.4%	0.2%	**7.6%**
J	Tenderloin	1.3%	1.3%		1.0%		**3.6%**
X	Out of SF				0.6%		**0.6%**
Grand Total		**25.8%**	**41.7%**	**0.1%**	**31.3%**	**1.1%**	**100.0%**

BURGLARY - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

BURGLARY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2024	15	299	84	148	670	109	560	**1,885**
Q1 2025	5	206	76	140	510	69	454	**1,460**
Difference	-10	-93	-8	-8	-160	-40	-106	**-425**
% Change	**-66.7%**	**-31.1%**	**-9.5%**	**-5.4%**	**-23.9%**	**-36.7%**	**-18.9%**	**-22.5%**

BURGLARY - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

BURGLARY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2024	17	165	297	266	226	246	668	**1,885**
Q1 2025	17	122	286	209	177	173	476	**1,460**
Difference	0	-43	-11	-57	-49	-73	-192	**-425**
% Change	**0.0%**	**-26.1%**	**-3.7%**	**-21.4%**	**-21.7%**	**-29.7%**	**-28.7%**	**-22.5%**

BURGLARY - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

BURGLARY	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2024	427	791		631	36	**1,885**
Q1 2025	376	609	2	457	16	**1,460**
Difference	-51	-182	2	-174	-20	**-425**
% Change	**-11.9%**	**-23.0%**	**not calc**	**-27.6%**	**-55.6%**	**-22.5%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2025

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	4.00	115.00	25.00	54.00	345.00	29.00	207.00	**779.00**
B	Southern	5.00	116.00	51.00	75.00	280.00	26.00	152.00	**705.00**
C	Bayview	2.00	44.00	49.00	39.00	73.00	11.00	52.00	**270.00**
D	Mission	4.00	72.00	24.00	93.00	289.00	20.00	153.00	**655.00**
E	Northern	4.00	115.00	44.00	68.00	282.00	31.00	191.00	**735.00**
F	Park	2.00	15.00	8.00	8.00	93.00	11.00	68.00	**205.00**
G	Richmond	1.00	47.00	16.00	15.00	105.00	14.00	90.00	**288.00**
H	Ingleside	1.00	53.00	16.00	64.00	144.00	13.00	58.00	**349.00**
I	Taraval	2.00	87.00	13.00	30.00	165.00	8.00	103.00	**408.00**
J	Tenderloin	5.00	39.00	31.00	39.00	67.00	14.00	62.00	**257.00**
X	Out of SF	1.00	11.00	7.00	3.00	42.00	1.00	34.00	**99.00**
Grand Total		**31.00**	**714.00**	**284.00**	**488.00**	**1885.00**	**178.00**	**1170.00**	**4750.00**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	0.1%	2.4%	0.5%	1.1%	7.3%	0.6%	4.4%	**16.4%**
B	Southern	0.1%	2.4%	1.1%	1.6%	5.9%	0.5%	3.2%	**14.8%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.9%	1.0%	0.8%	1.5%	0.2%	1.1%	**5.7%**
D	Mission	0.1%	1.5%	0.5%	2.0%	6.1%	0.4%	3.2%	**13.8%**
E	Northern	0.1%	2.4%	0.9%	1.4%	5.9%	0.7%	4.0%	**15.5%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	2.0%	0.2%	1.4%	**4.3%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	1.0%	0.3%	0.3%	2.2%	0.3%	1.9%	**6.1%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	1.1%	0.3%	1.3%	3.0%	0.3%	1.2%	**7.3%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	1.8%	0.3%	0.6%	3.5%	0.2%	2.2%	**8.6%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%	1.4%	0.3%	1.3%	**5.4%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%	0.0%	0.7%	**2.1%**
Grand Total		**0.7%**	**15.0%**	**6.0%**	**10.3%**	**39.7%**	**3.7%**	**24.6%**	**100.0%**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	8.00	151.00	158.00	116.00	76.00	62.00	208.00	**779.00**
B	Southern	1.00	194.00	192.00	91.00	57.00	42.00	128.00	**705.00**
C	Bayview	8.00	34.00	81.00	50.00	34.00	28.00	35.00	**270.00**
D	Mission	5.00	134.00	152.00	84.00	70.00	56.00	154.00	**655.00**
E	Northern	6.00	212.00	171.00	114.00	69.00	69.00	94.00	**735.00**
F	Park	3.00	60.00	50.00	29.00	24.00	18.00	21.00	**205.00**
G	Richmond	4.00	54.00	71.00	42.00	40.00	31.00	46.00	**288.00**
H	Ingleside	7.00	42.00	75.00	58.00	38.00	38.00	91.00	**349.00**
I	Taraval	7.00	95.00	70.00	64.00	42.00	56.00	74.00	**408.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	59.00	59.00	29.00	29.00	36.00	44.00	**257.00**
X	Out of SF		22.00	18.00	18.00	14.00	17.00	10.00	**99.00**
Grand Total		**50.00**	**1057.00**	**1097.00**	**695.00**	**493.00**	**453.00**	**905.00**	**4750.00**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.2%	3.2%	3.3%	2.4%	1.6%	1.3%	4.4%	**16.4%**
B	Southern	0.0%	4.1%	4.0%	1.9%	1.2%	0.9%	2.7%	**14.8%**
C	Bayview	0.2%	0.7%	1.7%	1.1%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%	**5.7%**
D	Mission	0.1%	2.8%	3.2%	1.8%	1.5%	1.2%	3.2%	**13.8%**
E	Northern	0.1%	4.5%	3.6%	2.4%	1.5%	1.5%	2.0%	**15.5%**
F	Park	0.1%	1.3%	1.1%	0.6%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	**4.3%**
G	Richmond	0.1%	1.1%	1.5%	0.9%	0.8%	0.7%	1.0%	**6.1%**
H	Ingleside	0.1%	0.9%	1.6%	1.2%	0.8%	0.8%	1.9%	**7.3%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	2.0%	1.5%	1.3%	0.9%	1.2%	1.6%	**8.6%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	0.8%	0.9%	**5.4%**
X	Out of SF		0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%	**2.1%**
Grand Total		**1.1%**	**22.3%**	**23.1%**	**14.6%**	**10.4%**	**9.5%**	**19.1%**	**100.0%**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	248.00	323.00		202.00	6.00	**779.00**
B	Southern	224.00	341.00	2.00	129.00	9.00	**705.00**
C	Bayview	119.00	114.00		36.00	1.00	**270.00**
D	Mission	207.00	293.00		151.00	4.00	**655.00**
E	Northern	306.00	330.00		95.00	4.00	**735.00**
F	Park	83.00	94.00		25.00	3.00	**205.00**
G	Richmond	101.00	134.00		52.00	1.00	**288.00**
H	Ingleside	115.00	138.00		95.00	1.00	**349.00**
I	Taraval	122.00	208.00		77.00	1.00	**408.00**
J	Tenderloin	87.00	128.00		42.00		**257.00**
X	Out of SF	48.00	39.00		11.00	1.00	**99.00**
Grand Total		**1660.00**	**2142.00**	**2.00**	**915.00**	**31.00**	**4750.00**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	5.2%	6.8%		4.3%	0.1%	**16.4%**
B	Southern	4.7%	7.2%	0.0%	2.7%	0.2%	**14.8%**
C	Bayview	2.5%	2.4%		0.8%	0.0%	**5.7%**
D	Mission	4.4%	6.2%		3.2%	0.1%	**13.8%**
E	Northern	6.4%	6.9%		2.0%	0.1%	**15.5%**
F	Park	1.7%	2.0%		0.5%	0.1%	**4.3%**
G	Richmond	2.1%	2.8%		1.1%	0.0%	**6.1%**
H	Ingleside	2.4%	2.9%		2.0%	0.0%	**7.3%**
I	Taraval	2.6%	4.4%		1.6%	0.0%	**8.6%**
J	Tenderloin	1.8%	2.7%		0.9%		**5.4%**
X	Out of SF	1.0%	0.8%		0.2%	0.0%	**2.1%**
Grand Total		**34.9%**	**45.1%**	**0.0%**	**19.3%**	**0.7%**	**100.0%**

LARCENY THEFT - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

LARCENY THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2024	23	1,144	338	685	2,923	255	1,884	**7,252**
Q1 2025	31	714	284	488	1,885	178	1,170	**4,750**
Difference	8	-430	-54	-197	-1,038	-77	-714	**-2,502**
% Change	**34.8%**	**-37.6%**	**-16.0%**	**-28.8%**	**-35.5%**	**-30.2%**	**-37.9%**	**-34.5%**

LARCENY THEFT - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

LARCENY THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2024	118	1,460	1,483	1,087	774	688	1,642	**7,252**
Q1 2025	50	1,057	1,097	695	493	453	905	**4,750**
Difference	-68	-403	-386	-392	-281	-235	-737	**-2,502**
% Change	**-57.6%**	**-27.6%**	**-26.0%**	**-36.1%**	**-36.3%**	**-34.2%**	**-44.9%**	**-34.5%**

LARCENY THEFT - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

LARCENY THEFT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2024	2,364	3,221	2	1,631	34	**7,252**
Q1 2025	1,660	2,142	2	915	31	**4,750**
Difference	-704	-1,079	0	-716	-3	**-2,502**
% Change	**-29.8%**	**-33.5%**	**0.0%**	**-43.9%**	**-8.8%**	**-34.5%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT						PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central			2.00	80.00		3.00	**85.00**
B	Southern		1.00	1.00	97.00	1.00	5.00	**105.00**
C	Bayview	1.00	1.00	8.00	160.00	2.00	1.00	**173.00**
D	Mission			2.00	123.00			**125.00**
E	Northern	1.00	1.00	1.00	94.00		4.00	**101.00**
F	Park	1.00			46.00		1.00	**48.00**
G	Richmond				43.00	2.00	2.00	**47.00**
H	Ingleside	2.00	1.00	1.00	131.00	1.00	2.00	**138.00**
I	Taraval			1.00	101.00		3.00	**105.00**
J	Tenderloin			1.00	51.00			**52.00**
X	Out of SF				7.00			**7.00**
Grand Total		**5.00**	**4.00**	**17.00**	**933.00**	**6.00**	**21.00**	**986.00**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT						PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central			0.2%	8.1%		0.3%	**8.6%**
B	Southern		0.1%	0.1%	9.8%	0.1%	0.5%	**10.6%**
C	Bayview	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%	16.2%	0.2%	0.1%	**17.5%**
D	Mission			0.2%	12.5%			**12.7%**
E	Northern	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	9.5%		0.4%	**10.2%**
F	Park	0.1%			4.7%		0.1%	**4.9%**
G	Richmond				4.4%	0.2%	0.2%	**4.8%**
H	Ingleside	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	13.3%	0.1%	0.2%	**14.0%**
I	Taraval			0.1%	10.2%		0.3%	**10.6%**
J	Tenderloin			0.1%	5.2%			**5.3%**
X	Out of SF				0.7%			**0.7%**
Grand Total		**0.5%**	**0.4%**	**1.7%**	**94.6%**	**0.6%**	**2.1%**	**100.0%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	1.00	25.00	22.00	14.00	8.00	13.00	2.00	**85.00**
B	Southern		25.00	29.00	19.00	12.00	12.00	8.00	**105.00**
C	Bayview		45.00	36.00	31.00	27.00	26.00	8.00	**173.00**
D	Mission		25.00	37.00	26.00	21.00	15.00	1.00	**125.00**
E	Northern		21.00	37.00	19.00	9.00	15.00		**101.00**
F	Park		10.00	13.00	8.00	6.00	11.00		**48.00**
G	Richmond		15.00	6.00	8.00	7.00	10.00	1.00	**47.00**
H	Ingleside		28.00	28.00	30.00	29.00	19.00	4.00	**138.00**
I	Taraval		31.00	28.00	20.00	9.00	14.00	3.00	**105.00**
J	Tenderloin		13.00	11.00	9.00	8.00	8.00	3.00	**52.00**
X	Out of SF			3.00	1.00		2.00	1.00	**7.00**
Grand Total		**1.00**	**238.00**	**250.00**	**185.00**	**136.00**	**145.00**	**31.00**	**986.00**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.1%	2.5%	2.2%	1.4%	0.8%	1.3%	0.2%	**8.6%**
B	Southern		2.5%	2.9%	1.9%	1.2%	1.2%	0.8%	**10.6%**
C	Bayview		4.6%	3.7%	3.1%	2.7%	2.6%	0.8%	**17.5%**
D	Mission		2.5%	3.8%	2.6%	2.1%	1.5%	0.1%	**12.7%**
E	Northern		2.1%	3.8%	1.9%	0.9%	1.5%		**10.2%**
F	Park		1.0%	1.3%	0.8%	0.6%	1.1%		**4.9%**
G	Richmond		1.5%	0.6%	0.8%	0.7%	1.0%	0.1%	**4.8%**
H	Ingleside		2.8%	2.8%	3.0%	2.9%	1.9%	0.4%	**14.0%**
I	Taraval		3.1%	2.8%	2.0%	0.9%	1.4%	0.3%	**10.6%**
J	Tenderloin		1.3%	1.1%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%	0.3%	**5.3%**
X	Out of SF			0.3%	0.1%		0.2%	0.1%	**0.7%**
Grand Total		**0.1%**	**24.1%**	**25.4%**	**18.8%**	**13.8%**	**14.7%**	**3.1%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2025

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	1.00	4.00	80.00		**85.00**
B	Southern	3.00	5.00	97.00		**105.00**
C	Bayview	7.00	6.00	160.00		**173.00**
D	Mission	2.00	1.00	122.00		**125.00**
E	Northern	4.00	3.00	94.00		**101.00**
F	Park		2.00	46.00		**48.00**
G	Richmond	1.00	3.00	43.00		**47.00**
H	Ingleside	3.00	3.00	131.00	1.00	**138.00**
I	Taraval	2.00	2.00	101.00		**105.00**
J	Tenderloin		1.00	51.00		**52.00**
X	Out of SF			7.00		**7.00**
Grand Total		**23.00**	**30.00**	**932.00**	**1.00**	**986.00**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.1%	0.4%	8.1%		**8.6%**
B	Southern	0.3%	0.5%	9.8%		**10.6%**
C	Bayview	0.7%	0.6%	16.2%		**17.5%**
D	Mission	0.2%	0.1%	12.4%		**12.7%**
E	Northern	0.4%	0.3%	9.5%		**10.2%**
F	Park		0.2%	4.7%		**4.9%**
G	Richmond	0.1%	0.3%	4.4%		**4.8%**
H	Ingleside	0.3%	0.3%	13.3%	0.1%	**14.0%**
I	Taraval	0.2%	0.2%	10.2%		**10.6%**
J	Tenderloin		0.1%	5.2%		**5.3%**
X	Out of SF			0.7%		**0.7%**
Grand Total		**2.3%**	**3.0%**	**94.5%**	**0.1%**	**100.0%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2024	3	16	11	21	1,504	17	59	**1,631**
Q1 2025		5	4	17	933	6	21	**986**
Difference	-3	-11	-7	-4	-571	-11	-38	**-645**
% Change	**-100.0%**	**-68.8%**	**-63.6%**	**-19.0%**	**-38.0%**	**-64.7%**	**-64.4%**	**-39.5%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2024	1	335	370	340	226	270	89	**1,631**
Q1 2025	1	238	250	185	136	145	31	**986**
Difference	0	-97	-120	-155	-90	-125	-58	**-645**
% Change	**0.0%**	**-29.0%**	**-32.4%**	**-45.6%**	**-39.8%**	**-46.3%**	**-65.2%**	**-39.5%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2024	41	82	1,503	5	**1,631**
Q1 2025	23	30	932	1	**986**
Difference	-18	-52	-571	-4	**-645**
% Change	**-43.9%**	**-63.4%**	**-38.0%**	**-80.0%**	**-39.5%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2025

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		1.00	4.00	11.00			7.00	**23.00**
B	Southern		2.00	11.00	4.00	6.00	3.00	13.00	**39.00**
C	Bayview	1.00	1.00	4.00	3.00		1.00		**10.00**
D	Mission		2.00		10.00	36.00	2.00	5.00	**55.00**
E	Northern	1.00	4.00	2.00	4.00		2.00	10.00	**23.00**
F	Park		1.00	2.00			1.00	1.00	**5.00**
G	Richmond			3.00	1.00	1.00		4.00	**9.00**
H	Ingleside		1.00	3.00	8.00			3.00	**15.00**
I	Taraval		4.00	1.00	3.00		2.00	2.00	**12.00**
J	Tenderloin		1.00	8.00	3.00			7.00	**19.00**
X	Out of SF			4.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**8.00**
Grand Total		**2.00**	**17.00**	**42.00**	**48.00**	**44.00**	**12.00**	**53.00**	**218.00**

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		0.5%	1.8%	5.0%			3.2%	**10.6%**
B	Southern		0.9%	5.0%	1.8%	2.8%	1.4%	6.0%	**17.9%**
C	Bayview	0.5%	0.5%	1.8%	1.4%		0.5%		**4.6%**
D	Mission		0.9%		4.6%	16.5%	0.9%	2.3%	**25.2%**
E	Northern	0.5%	1.8%	0.9%	1.8%		0.9%	4.6%	**10.6%**
F	Park		0.5%	0.9%			0.5%	0.5%	**2.3%**
G	Richmond			1.4%	0.5%	0.5%		1.8%	**4.1%**
H	Ingleside		0.5%	1.4%	3.7%			1.4%	**6.9%**
I	Taraval		1.8%	0.5%	1.4%		0.9%	0.9%	**5.5%**
J	Tenderloin		0.5%	3.7%	1.4%			3.2%	**8.7%**
X	Out of SF			1.8%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	**3.7%**
Grand Total		**0.9%**	**7.8%**	**19.3%**	**22.0%**	**20.2%**	**5.5%**	**24.3%**	**100.0%**

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	2.00	8.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	1.00		**23.00**
B	Southern	12.00	9.00	10.00	3.00	3.00		2.00	**39.00**
C	Bayview	4.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00			**10.00**
D	Mission	13.00	18.00	10.00	7.00	4.00	2.00	1.00	**55.00**
E	Northern	1.00	10.00	7.00	2.00	2.00	1.00		**23.00**
F	Park		1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00			**5.00**
G	Richmond	3.00	2.00	3.00				1.00	**9.00**
H	Ingleside	3.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	1.00	1.00		**15.00**
I	Taraval	4.00	7.00	1.00					**12.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	8.00	6.00	2.00	2.00			**19.00**
X	Out of SF	1.00	4.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	**8.00**
Grand Total		**44.00**	**73.00**	**50.00**	**22.00**	**19.00**	**5.00**	**5.00**	**218.00**

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.9%	3.7%	2.3%	1.4%	1.8%	0.5%		**10.6%**
B	Southern	5.5%	4.1%	4.6%	1.4%	1.4%		0.9%	**17.9%**
C	Bayview	1.8%	0.9%	0.5%	0.9%	0.5%			**4.6%**
D	Mission	6.0%	8.3%	4.6%	3.2%	1.8%	0.9%	0.5%	**25.2%**
E	Northern	0.5%	4.6%	3.2%	0.9%	0.9%	0.5%		**10.6%**
F	Park		0.5%	0.9%	0.5%	0.5%			**2.3%**
G	Richmond	1.4%	0.9%	1.4%				0.5%	**4.1%**
H	Ingleside	1.4%	1.8%	1.8%	0.9%	0.5%	0.5%		**6.9%**
I	Taraval	1.8%	3.2%	0.5%					**5.5%**
J	Tenderloin	0.5%	3.7%	2.8%	0.9%	0.9%			**8.7%**
X	Out of SF	0.5%	1.8%	0.5%		0.5%		0.5%	**3.7%**
Grand Total		**20.2%**	**33.5%**	**22.9%**	**10.1%**	**8.7%**	**2.3%**	**2.3%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2025

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	20.00	3.00		**23.00**
B	Southern	31.00	4.00	4.00	**39.00**
C	Bayview	8.00	2.00		**10.00**
D	Mission	22.00	4.00	29.00	**55.00**
E	Northern	20.00	3.00		**23.00**
F	Park	5.00			**5.00**
G	Richmond	5.00	3.00	1.00	**9.00**
H	Ingleside	14.00	1.00		**15.00**
I	Taraval	9.00	3.00		**12.00**
J	Tenderloin	16.00	3.00		**19.00**
X	Out of SF	7.00		1.00	**8.00**
Grand Total		**157.00**	**26.00**	**35.00**	**218.00**

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	9.2%	1.4%		**10.6%**
B	Southern	14.2%	1.8%	1.8%	**17.9%**
C	Bayview	3.7%	0.9%		**4.6%**
D	Mission	10.1%	1.8%	13.3%	**25.2%**
E	Northern	9.2%	1.4%		**10.6%**
F	Park	2.3%			**2.3%**
G	Richmond	2.3%	1.4%	0.5%	**4.1%**
H	Ingleside	6.4%	0.5%		**6.9%**
I	Taraval	4.1%	1.4%		**5.5%**
J	Tenderloin	7.3%	1.4%		**8.7%**
X	Out of SF	3.2%		0.5%	**3.7%**
Grand Total		**72.0%**	**11.9%**	**16.1%**	**100.0%**

SEXUAL ASSAULT - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

SEXUAL ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2024	3	13	32	51	32	7	46	**184**
Q1 2025	2	17	42	48	44	12	53	**218**
Difference	-1	4	10	-3	12	5	7	**34**
% Change	**-33.3%**	**30.8%**	**31.3%**	**-5.9%**	**37.5%**	**71.4%**	**15.2%**	**18.5%**

SEXUAL ASSAULT - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

SEXUAL ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2024	50	53	36	22	10	11	2	**184**
Q1 2025	44	73	50	22	19	5	5	**218**
Difference	-6	20	14	0	9	-6	3	**34**
% Change	**-12.0%**	**37.7%**	**38.9%**	**0.0%**	**90.0%**	**-54.5%**	**150.0%**	**18.5%**

SEXUAL ASSAULT - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

SEXUAL ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2024	141	28	2	13		184
Q1 2025	157	26		35		218
Difference	16	-2	-2	22	0	34
% Change	**11.3%**	**-7.1%**	**-100.0%**	**169.2%**	**not calc**	**18.5%**

VANDALISM VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central		18.00	11.00	14.00	93.00	6.00	34.00	**176.00**
B	Southern	2.00	23.00	15.00	25.00	88.00	7.00	37.00	**197.00**
C	Bayview		18.00	53.00	38.00	32.00	9.00	18.00	**168.00**
D	Mission	2.00	17.00	15.00	53.00	80.00	9.00	40.00	**216.00**
E	Northern	1.00	18.00	24.00	15.00	92.00	10.00	51.00	**211.00**
F	Park		2.00	3.00	10.00	15.00	4.00	25.00	**59.00**
G	Richmond		18.00	3.00		23.00	2.00	25.00	**71.00**
H	Ingleside		27.00	20.00	40.00	41.00	6.00	29.00	**163.00**
I	Taraval	1.00	21.00	10.00	13.00	42.00	6.00	34.00	**127.00**
J	Tenderloin		3.00	18.00	12.00	57.00	6.00	18.00	**114.00**
X	Out of SF		1.00						**1.00**
Grand Total		**6.00**	**166.00**	**172.00**	**220.00**	**563.00**	**65.00**	**311.00**	**1503.00**

VANDALISM VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central		1.2%	0.7%	0.9%	6.2%	0.4%	2.3%	**11.7%**
B	Southern	0.1%	1.5%	1.0%	1.7%	5.9%	0.5%	2.5%	**13.1%**
C	Bayview		1.2%	3.5%	2.5%	2.1%	0.6%	1.2%	**11.2%**
D	Mission	0.1%	1.1%	1.0%	3.5%	5.3%	0.6%	2.7%	**14.4%**
E	Northern	0.1%	1.2%	1.6%	1.0%	6.1%	0.7%	3.4%	**14.0%**
F	Park		0.1%	0.2%	0.7%	1.0%	0.3%	1.7%	**3.9%**
G	Richmond		1.2%	0.2%		1.5%	0.1%	1.7%	**4.7%**
H	Ingleside		1.8%	1.3%	2.7%	2.7%	0.4%	1.9%	**10.8%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	1.4%	0.7%	0.9%	2.8%	0.4%	2.3%	**8.4%**
J	Tenderloin		0.2%	1.2%	0.8%	3.8%	0.4%	1.2%	**7.6%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%						**0.1%**
Grand Total		**0.4%**	**11.0%**	**11.4%**	**14.6%**	**37.5%**	**4.3%**	**20.7%**	**100.0%**

VANDALISM VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central		16.00	22.00	19.00	12.00	23.00	84.00	**176.00**
B	Southern	1.00	25.00	37.00	29.00	17.00	14.00	74.00	**197.00**
C	Bayview	4.00	30.00	23.00	35.00	24.00	21.00	31.00	**168.00**
D	Mission	1.00	24.00	42.00	38.00	26.00	18.00	67.00	**216.00**
E	Northern		33.00	39.00	30.00	19.00	29.00	61.00	**211.00**
F	Park	2.00	4.00	12.00	8.00	11.00	10.00	12.00	**59.00**
G	Richmond		6.00	8.00	15.00	17.00	12.00	13.00	**71.00**
H	Ingleside		18.00	32.00	37.00	21.00	29.00	26.00	**163.00**
I	Taraval	2.00	14.00	22.00	19.00	16.00	26.00	28.00	**127.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	9.00	21.00	10.00	11.00	5.00	57.00	**114.00**
X	Out of SF					1.00			**1.00**
Grand Total		**11.00**	**179.00**	**258.00**	**240.00**	**175.00**	**187.00**	**453.00**	**1503.00**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2025

VANDALISM VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central		1.1%	1.5%	1.3%	0.8%	1.5%	5.6%	**11.7%**
B	Southern	0.1%	1.7%	2.5%	1.9%	1.1%	0.9%	4.9%	**13.1%**
C	Bayview	0.3%	2.0%	1.5%	2.3%	1.6%	1.4%	2.1%	**11.2%**
D	Mission	0.1%	1.6%	2.8%	2.5%	1.7%	1.2%	4.5%	**14.4%**
E	Northern		2.2%	2.6%	2.0%	1.3%	1.9%	4.1%	**14.0%**
F	Park	0.1%	0.3%	0.8%	0.5%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	**3.9%**
G	Richmond		0.4%	0.5%	1.0%	1.1%	0.8%	0.9%	**4.7%**
H	Ingleside		1.2%	2.1%	2.5%	1.4%	1.9%	1.7%	**10.8%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	0.9%	1.5%	1.3%	1.1%	1.7%	1.9%	**8.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	0.6%	1.4%	0.7%	0.7%	0.3%	3.8%	**7.6%**
X	Out of SF					0.1%			**0.1%**
Grand Total		**0.7%**	**11.9%**	**17.2%**	**16.0%**	**11.6%**	**12.4%**	**30.1%**	**100.0%**

VANDALISM VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	34.00	58.00	81.00	3.00	**176.00**
B	Southern	48.00	73.00	75.00	1.00	**197.00**
C	Bayview	69.00	71.00	27.00	1.00	**168.00**
D	Mission	58.00	89.00	67.00	2.00	**216.00**
E	Northern	72.00	74.00	63.00	2.00	**211.00**
F	Park	19.00	28.00	12.00		**59.00**
G	Richmond	20.00	35.00	16.00		**71.00**
H	Ingleside	61.00	76.00	24.00	2.00	**163.00**
I	Taraval	34.00	63.00	30.00		**127.00**
J	Tenderloin	25.00	33.00	56.00		**114.00**
X	Out of SF		1.00			**1.00**
Grand Total		**440.00**	**601.00**	**451.00**	**11.00**	**1503.00**

VANDALISM VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	2.3%	3.9%	5.4%	0.2%	**11.7%**
B	Southern	3.2%	4.9%	5.0%	0.1%	**13.1%**
C	Bayview	4.6%	4.7%	1.8%	0.1%	**11.2%**
D	Mission	3.9%	5.9%	4.5%	0.1%	**14.4%**
E	Northern	4.8%	4.9%	4.2%	0.1%	**14.0%**
F	Park	1.3%	1.9%	0.8%		**3.9%**
G	Richmond	1.3%	2.3%	1.1%		**4.7%**
H	Ingleside	4.1%	5.1%	1.6%	0.1%	**10.8%**
I	Taraval	2.3%	4.2%	2.0%		**8.4%**
J	Tenderloin	1.7%	2.2%	3.7%		**7.6%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%			**0.1%**
Grand Total		**29.3%**	**40.0%**	**30.0%**	**0.7%**	**100.0%**

VANDALISM - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

VANDALISM	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2024	7	244	153	282	833	97	431	**2,047**
Q1 2025	6	166	172	220	563	65	311	**1,503**
Difference	-1	-78	19	-62	-270	-32	-120	**-544**
% Change	**-14.3%**	**-32.0%**	**12.4%**	**-22.0%**	**-32.4%**	**-33.0%**	**-27.8%**	**-26.6%**

VANDALISM - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

VANDALISM	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2024	21	246	357	287	241	255	640	**2,047**
Q1 2025	11	179	258	240	175	187	453	**1,503**
Difference	-10	-67	-99	-47	-66	-68	-187	**-544**
% Change	**-47.6%**	**-27.2%**	**-27.7%**	**-16.4%**	**-27.4%**	**-26.7%**	**-29.2%**	**-26.6%**

VANDALISM - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

VANDALISM	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2024	573	828		636	10	**2,047**
Q1 2025	440	601		451	11	**1,503**
Difference	-133	-227	0	-185	1	**-544**
% Change	**-23.2%**	**-27.4%**	**not calc**	**-29.1%**	**10.0%**	**-26.6%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2025

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	1.00	13.00	19.00	35.00	2.00	4.00	22.00	**96.00**
B	Southern	3.00	14.00	51.00	41.00	3.00	6.00	32.00	**150.00**
C	Bayview		6.00	66.00	67.00	2.00		19.00	**160.00**
D	Mission	2.00	3.00	9.00	52.00	7.00	1.00	10.00	**84.00**
E	Northern	2.00	18.00	26.00	20.00	2.00	3.00	38.00	**109.00**
F	Park		5.00	5.00	5.00		3.00	16.00	**34.00**
G	Richmond	1.00	6.00	3.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	14.00	**31.00**
H	Ingleside		14.00	24.00	45.00	4.00	2.00	14.00	**103.00**
I	Taraval		14.00	21.00	26.00		1.00	34.00	**96.00**
J	Tenderloin		1.00	61.00	41.00	2.00	4.00	22.00	**131.00**
X	Out of SF		3.00	5.00	1.00	2.00	1.00		**12.00**
Grand Total		**9.00**	**97.00**	**290.00**	**338.00**	**25.00**	**26.00**	**221.00**	**1006.00**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	0.1%	1.3%	1.9%	3.5%	0.2%	0.4%	2.2%	**9.5%**
B	Southern	0.3%	1.4%	5.1%	4.1%	0.3%	0.6%	3.2%	**14.9%**
C	Bayview		0.6%	6.6%	6.7%	0.2%		1.9%	**15.9%**
D	Mission	0.2%	0.3%	0.9%	5.2%	0.7%	0.1%	1.0%	**8.3%**
E	Northern	0.2%	1.8%	2.6%	2.0%	0.2%	0.3%	3.8%	**10.8%**
F	Park		0.5%	0.5%	0.5%		0.3%	1.6%	**3.4%**
G	Richmond	0.1%	0.6%	0.3%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	1.4%	**3.1%**
H	Ingleside		1.4%	2.4%	4.5%	0.4%	0.2%	1.4%	**10.2%**
I	Taraval		1.4%	2.1%	2.6%		0.1%	3.4%	**9.5%**
J	Tenderloin		0.1%	6.1%	4.1%	0.2%	0.4%	2.2%	**13.0%**
X	Out of SF		0.3%	0.5%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%		**1.2%**
Grand Total		**0.9%**	**9.6%**	**28.8%**	**33.6%**	**2.5%**	**2.6%**	**22.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2025

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	8.00	20.00	36.00	13.00	15.00	3.00	1.00	**96.00**
B	Southern	16.00	45.00	44.00	24.00	8.00	8.00	5.00	**150.00**
C	Bayview	29.00	35.00	33.00	33.00	21.00	7.00	2.00	**160.00**
D	Mission	9.00	17.00	21.00	17.00	16.00	2.00	2.00	**84.00**
E	Northern	3.00	21.00	46.00	18.00	4.00	16.00	1.00	**109.00**
F	Park	1.00	10.00	8.00	10.00	3.00	2.00		**34.00**
G	Richmond	6.00	8.00	8.00	6.00	2.00		1.00	**31.00**
H	Ingleside	15.00	29.00	28.00	21.00	3.00	6.00	1.00	**103.00**
I	Taraval	9.00	24.00	27.00	16.00	15.00	5.00		**96.00**
J	Tenderloin	24.00	28.00	34.00	28.00	5.00	8.00	4.00	**131.00**
X	Out of SF		1.00	4.00	5.00	1.00		1.00	**12.00**
Grand Total		**120.00**	**238.00**	**289.00**	**191.00**	**93.00**	**57.00**	**18.00**	**1006.00**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.8%	2.0%	3.6%	1.3%	1.5%	0.3%	0.1%	**9.5%**
B	Southern	1.6%	4.5%	4.4%	2.4%	0.8%	0.8%	0.5%	**14.9%**
C	Bayview	2.9%	3.5%	3.3%	3.3%	2.1%	0.7%	0.2%	**15.9%**
D	Mission	0.9%	1.7%	2.1%	1.7%	1.6%	0.2%	0.2%	**8.3%**
E	Northern	0.3%	2.1%	4.6%	1.8%	0.4%	1.6%	0.1%	**10.8%**
F	Park	0.1%	1.0%	0.8%	1.0%	0.3%	0.2%		**3.4%**
G	Richmond	0.6%	0.8%	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%		0.1%	**3.1%**
H	Ingleside	1.5%	2.9%	2.8%	2.1%	0.3%	0.6%	0.1%	**10.2%**
I	Taraval	0.9%	2.4%	2.7%	1.6%	1.5%	0.5%		**9.5%**
J	Tenderloin	2.4%	2.8%	3.4%	2.8%	0.5%	0.8%	0.4%	**13.0%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%	0.4%	0.5%	0.1%		0.1%	**1.2%**
Grand Total		**11.9%**	**23.7%**	**28.7%**	**19.0%**	**9.2%**	**5.7%**	**1.8%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2025

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	60.00	34.00		2.00	**96.00**
B	Southern	100.00	44.00	1.00	5.00	**150.00**
C	Bayview	112.00	46.00		2.00	**160.00**
D	Mission	60.00	19.00		5.00	**84.00**
E	Northern	85.00	22.00		2.00	**109.00**
F	Park	24.00	9.00		1.00	**34.00**
G	Richmond	22.00	8.00		1.00	**31.00**
H	Ingleside	71.00	29.00		3.00	**103.00**
I	Taraval	62.00	34.00			**96.00**
J	Tenderloin	84.00	46.00		1.00	**131.00**
X	Out of SF	9.00	1.00		2.00	**12.00**
Grand Total		**689.00**	**292.00**	**1.00**	**24.00**	**1006.00**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	6.0%	3.4%		0.2%	**9.5%**
B	Southern	9.9%	4.4%	0.1%	0.5%	**14.9%**
C	Bayview	11.1%	4.6%		0.2%	**15.9%**
D	Mission	6.0%	1.9%		0.5%	**8.3%**
E	Northern	8.4%	2.2%		0.2%	**10.8%**
F	Park	2.4%	0.9%		0.1%	**3.4%**
G	Richmond	2.2%	0.8%		0.1%	**3.1%**
H	Ingleside	7.1%	2.9%		0.3%	**10.2%**
I	Taraval	6.2%	3.4%			**9.5%**
J	Tenderloin	8.3%	4.6%		0.1%	**13.0%**
X	Out of SF	0.9%	0.1%		0.2%	**1.2%**
Grand Total		**68.5%**	**29.0%**	**0.1%**	**2.4%**	**100.0%**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2024	8	130	254	295	25	23	220	**955**
Q1 2025	9	97	290	338	25	26	221	**1,006**
Difference	1	-33	36	43	0	3	1	**51**
% Change	**12.5%**	**-25.4%**	**14.2%**	**14.6%**	**0.0%**	**13.0%**	**0.5%**	**5.3%**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2024	112	227	274	172	91	53	26	**955**
Q1 2025	120	238	289	191	93	57	18	**1,006**
Difference	8	11	15	19	2	4	-8	**51**
% Change	**7.1%**	**4.8%**	**5.5%**	**11.0%**	**2.2%**	**7.5%**	**-30.8%**	**5.3%**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2024	667	268	1	16	3	**955**
Q1 2025	689	292	1	24		**1,006**
Difference	22	24	0	8	-3	**51**
% Change	**3.3%**	**9.0%**	**0.0%**	**50.0%**	**-100.0%**	**5.3%**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	1.00	7.00		1.00			2.00	**11.00**
B	Southern		3.00	4.00	1.00			9.00	**17.00**
C	Bayview		2.00	5.00				1.00	**8.00**
D	Mission		3.00	1.00	8.00		1.00	7.00	**20.00**
E	Northern		1.00	1.00				10.00	**12.00**
F	Park		2.00		1.00			4.00	**7.00**
G	Richmond		2.00	2.00				2.00	**6.00**
H	Ingleside	1.00	2.00		2.00			6.00	**11.00**
I	Taraval		3.00	1.00				4.00	**8.00**
J	Tenderloin	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	1.00		7.00	**18.00**
Grand Total		**4.00**	**29.00**	**16.00**	**15.00**	**1.00**	**1.00**	**52.00**	**118.00**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	0.8%	5.9%		0.8%			1.7%	**9.3%**
B	Southern		2.5%	3.4%	0.8%			7.6%	**14.4%**
C	Bayview		1.7%	4.2%				0.8%	**6.8%**
D	Mission		2.5%	0.8%	6.8%		0.8%	5.9%	**16.9%**
E	Northern		0.8%	0.8%				8.5%	**10.2%**
F	Park		1.7%		0.8%			3.4%	**5.9%**
G	Richmond		1.7%	1.7%				1.7%	**5.1%**
H	Ingleside	0.8%	1.7%		1.7%			5.1%	**9.3%**
I	Taraval		2.5%	0.8%				3.4%	**6.8%**
J	Tenderloin	1.7%	3.4%	1.7%	1.7%	0.8%		5.9%	**15.3%**
Grand Total		**3.4%**	**24.6%**	**13.6%**	**12.7%**	**0.8%**	**0.8%**	**44.1%**	**100.0%**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**65+**	
A	Central	11.00	**11.00**
B	Southern	17.00	**17.00**
C	Bayview	8.00	**8.00**
D	Mission	20.00	**20.00**
E	Northern	12.00	**12.00**
F	Park	7.00	**7.00**
G	Richmond	6.00	**6.00**
H	Ingleside	11.00	**11.00**
I	Taraval	8.00	**8.00**
J	Tenderloin	18.00	**18.00**
Grand Total		**118.00**	**118.00**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**65+**	
A	Central	9.3%	**9.3%**
B	Southern	14.4%	**14.4%**
C	Bayview	6.8%	**6.8%**
D	Mission	16.9%	**16.9%**
E	Northern	10.2%	**10.2%**
F	Park	5.9%	**5.9%**
G	Richmond	5.1%	**5.1%**
H	Ingleside	9.3%	**9.3%**
I	Taraval	6.8%	**6.8%**
J	Tenderloin	15.3%	**15.3%**
Grand Total		**100.0%**	**100.0%**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	5.00	6.00		**11.00**
B	Southern	8.00	9.00		**17.00**
C	Bayview	4.00	4.00		**8.00**
D	Mission	8.00	12.00		**20.00**
E	Northern	7.00	5.00		**12.00**
F	Park	2.00	5.00		**7.00**
G	Richmond	5.00	1.00		**6.00**
H	Ingleside	5.00	6.00		**11.00**
I	Taraval	6.00	2.00		**8.00**
J	Tenderloin	8.00	9.00	1.00	**18.00**
Grand Total		**58.00**	**59.00**	**1.00**	**118.00**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	4.2%	5.1%		**9.3%**
B	Southern	6.8%	7.6%		**14.4%**
C	Bayview	3.4%	3.4%		**6.8%**
D	Mission	6.8%	10.2%		**16.9%**
E	Northern	5.9%	4.2%		**10.2%**
F	Park	1.7%	4.2%		**5.9%**
G	Richmond	4.2%	0.8%		**5.1%**
H	Ingleside	4.2%	5.1%		**9.3%**
I	Taraval	5.1%	1.7%		**6.8%**
J	Tenderloin	6.8%	7.6%	0.8%	**15.3%**
Grand Total		**49.2%**	**50.0%**	**0.8%**	**100.0%**

ELDER ABUSE - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

ELDER ABUSE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2024	1	27	27	19		3	49	**126**
Q1 2025	4	29	16	15	1	1	52	**118**
Difference	3	2	-11	-4	1	-2	3	**-8**
% Change	**300.0%**	**7.4%**	**-40.7%**	**-21.1%**	**not calc**	**-66.7%**	**6.1%**	**-6.3%**

ELDER ABUSE - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

ELDER ABUSE	PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
	65+	
Q1 2024	126	**126**
Q1 2025	118	**118**
Difference	-8	**-8**
% Change	**-6.3%**	**-6.3%**

ELDER ABUSE - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

ELDER ABUSE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2024	60	66				**126**
Q1 2025	58	59		1		**118**
Difference	-2	-7	0	1	0	**-8**
% Change	**-3.3%**	**-10.6%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**-6.3%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2025

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT						PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**8.00**
B	Southern		15.00	5.00	1.00	2.00	4.00	**27.00**
C	Bayview	4.00	15.00	17.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	**41.00**
D	Mission	1.00	5.00	11.00	4.00			**21.00**
E	Northern		6.00	1.00		5.00	1.00	**13.00**
F	Park		1.00			1.00		**2.00**
G	Richmond	1.00	2.00	1.00			2.00	**6.00**
H	Ingleside	1.00	6.00	11.00			1.00	**19.00**
I	Taraval	2.00	5.00	6.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**16.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	5.00	9.00	1.00		2.00	**18.00**
X	Out of SF				1.00			**1.00**
Grand Total		**11.00**	**63.00**	**62.00**	**10.00**	**11.00**	**15.00**	**172.00**

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT						PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	0.6%	1.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	**4.7%**
B	Southern		8.7%	2.9%	0.6%	1.2%	2.3%	**15.7%**
C	Bayview	2.3%	8.7%	9.9%	0.6%	0.6%	1.7%	**23.8%**
D	Mission	0.6%	2.9%	6.4%	2.3%			**12.2%**
E	Northern		3.5%	0.6%		2.9%	0.6%	**7.6%**
F	Park		0.6%			0.6%		**1.2%**
G	Richmond	0.6%	1.2%	0.6%			1.2%	**3.5%**
H	Ingleside	0.6%	3.5%	6.4%			0.6%	**11.0%**
I	Taraval	1.2%	2.9%	3.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	**9.3%**
J	Tenderloin	0.6%	2.9%	5.2%	0.6%		1.2%	**10.5%**
X	Out of SF				0.6%			**0.6%**
Grand Total		**6.4%**	**36.6%**	**36.0%**	**5.8%**	**6.4%**	**8.7%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2025

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	
A	Central	8.00	**8.00**
B	Southern	27.00	**27.00**
C	Bayview	41.00	**41.00**
D	Mission	21.00	**21.00**
E	Northern	13.00	**13.00**
F	Park	2.00	**2.00**
G	Richmond	6.00	**6.00**
H	Ingleside	19.00	**19.00**
I	Taraval	16.00	**16.00**
J	Tenderloin	18.00	**18.00**
X	Out of SF	1.00	**1.00**
Grand Total		**172.00**	**172.00**

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	
A	Central	4.7%	**4.7%**
B	Southern	15.7%	**15.7%**
C	Bayview	23.8%	**23.8%**
D	Mission	12.2%	**12.2%**
E	Northern	7.6%	**7.6%**
F	Park	1.2%	**1.2%**
G	Richmond	3.5%	**3.5%**
H	Ingleside	11.0%	**11.0%**
I	Taraval	9.3%	**9.3%**
J	Tenderloin	10.5%	**10.5%**
X	Out of SF	0.6%	**0.6%**
Grand Total		**100.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2025

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	1.00	6.00	1.00	**8.00**
B	Southern	17.00	10.00		**27.00**
C	Bayview	23.00	18.00		**41.00**
D	Mission	12.00	5.00	4.00	**21.00**
E	Northern	8.00	5.00		**13.00**
F	Park		2.00		**2.00**
G	Richmond	2.00	4.00		**6.00**
H	Ingleside	8.00	11.00		**19.00**
I	Taraval	10.00	5.00	1.00	**16.00**
J	Tenderloin	7.00	11.00		**18.00**
X	Out of SF			1.00	**1.00**
Grand Total		**88.00**	**77.00**	**7.00**	**172.00**

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	0.6%	3.5%	0.6%	**4.7%**
B	Southern	9.9%	5.8%		**15.7%**
C	Bayview	13.4%	10.5%		**23.8%**
D	Mission	7.0%	2.9%	2.3%	**12.2%**
E	Northern	4.7%	2.9%		**7.6%**
F	Park		1.2%		**1.2%**
G	Richmond	1.2%	2.3%		**3.5%**
H	Ingleside	4.7%	6.4%		**11.0%**
I	Taraval	5.8%	2.9%	0.6%	**9.3%**
J	Tenderloin	4.1%	6.4%		**10.5%**
X	Out of SF			0.6%	**0.6%**
Grand Total		**51.2%**	**44.8%**	**4.1%**	**100.0%**

CHILD ABUSE - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

CHILD ABUSE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2024		13	37	87	14	10	24	**185**
Q1 2025		11	63	62	10	11	15	**172**
Difference	0	-2	26	-25	-4	1	-9	**-13**
% Change	**not calc**	**-15.4%**	**70.3%**	**-28.7%**	**-28.6%**	**10.0%**	**-37.5%**	**-7.0%**

CHILD ABUSE - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

CHILD ABUSE	PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
	0-17	
Q1 2024	185	**185**
Q1 2025	172	**172**
Difference	-13	**-13**
% Change	**-7.0%**	**-7.0%**

CHILD ABUSE - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

CHILD ABUSE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2024	103	80		2		**185**
Q1 2025	88	77		7		**172**
Difference	-15	-3	0	5	0	**-13**
% Change	**-14.6%**	**-3.8%**	**not calc**	**250.0%**	**not calc**	**-7.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 2025

HOMICIDE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central								**0**
B	Southern								**0**
C	Bayview		1						**1**
D	Mission				1				**1**
E	Northern			1					**1**
F	Park								**0**
G	Richmond								**0**
H	Ingleside			1					**1**
I	Taraval								**0**
J	Tenderloin								**0**
X	Out of SF								**0**
Grand Total		**0**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**

HOMICIDE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**25.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**25.0%**
E	Northern	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**25.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**25.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**25.0%**	**50.0%**	**25.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 2025

HOMICIDE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central								**0**
B	Southern								**0**
C	Bayview						1		**1**
D	Mission			1					**1**
E	Northern		1						**1**
F	Park								**0**
G	Richmond								**0**
H	Ingleside			1					**1**
I	Taraval								**0**
J	Tenderloin								**0**
X	Out of SF								**0**
Grand Total		**0**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**4**

HOMICIDE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	**25.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**25.0%**
E	Northern	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**25.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**25.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**25.0%**	**50.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**25.0%**	**0.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 2025

HOMICIDE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT				**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central					**0**
B	Southern					**0**
C	Bayview		1			**1**
D	Mission		1			**1**
E	Northern		1			**1**
F	Park					**0**
G	Richmond					**0**
H	Ingleside		1			**1**
I	Taraval					**0**
J	Tenderloin					**0**
X	Out of SF					**0**
Grand Total		**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**4**

HOMICIDE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT				**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**25.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**25.0%**
E	Northern	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**25.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**25.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**100.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**100.0%**

HOMICIDE - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

HOMICIDE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2024	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	**8**
Q1 2025	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	**4**
Difference	0	1	-1	-3	-1	0	0	**-4**
% Change	**not calc**	**not calc**	**-33.3%**	**-75.0%**	**-100.0%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**-50.0%**

HOMICIDE - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

HOMICIDE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2024	1	3	2	1	0	1	0	**8**
Q1 2025	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	**4**
Difference	-1	-2	0	-1	0	0	0	**-4**
% Change	**-100.0%**	**-66.7%**	**0.0%**	**-100.0%**	**not calc**	**0.0%**	**not calc**	**-50.0%**

HOMICIDE - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

HOMICIDE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2024	3	5	0	0	0	**8**
Q1 2025	0	4	0	0	0	**4**
Difference	-3	-1	0	0	0	**-4**
% Change	**-100.0%**	**-20.0%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**-50.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 2025

HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian/Asian Indian/ Other Asian	Black	Hispanic or Latin	Others	White	Unknown	COUNT
A	Central								**0**
B	Southern		2						**2**
C	Bayview		4					1	**5**
D	Mission				1				**1**
E	Northern				2				**2**
F	Park								**0**
G	Richmond								**0**
H	Ingleside		1		2				**3**
I	Taraval								**0**
J	Tenderloin			2	1				**3**
X	Out of SF								**0**
Grand Total		**0**	**7**	**2**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**16**

HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian	Black	Hispanic or Latin	Others	White	Unknown	COUNT
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**12.5%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	**31.3%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**6.3%**
E	Northern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**12.5%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**18.8%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**18.8%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**43.8%**	**12.5%**	**37.5%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**6.3%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 2025

HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	COUNT
A	Central								**0**
B	Southern		1			1			**2**
C	Bayview	1				1		3	**5**
D	Mission					1			**1**
E	Northern	1			1				**2**
F	Park								**0**
G	Richmond								**0**
H	Ingleside		1		1		1		**3**
I	Taraval								**0**
J	Tenderloin		1		2				**3**
X	Out of SF								**0**
Grand Total		**2**	**3**	**0**	**4**	**3**	**1**	**3**	**16**

HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	COUNT
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	**12.5%**
C	Bayview	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	18.8%	**31.3%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	**6.3%**
E	Northern	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**12.5%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	**18.8%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**18.8%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**12.5%**	**18.8%**	**0.0%**	**25.0%**	**18.8%**	**6.3%**	**18.8%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 2025

HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT					PERSON
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	COUNT
A	Central						**0**
B	Southern	2					**2**
C	Bayview		4			1	**5**
D	Mission		1				**1**
E	Northern		2				**2**
F	Park						**0**
G	Richmond						**0**
H	Ingleside	2	1				**3**
I	Taraval						**0**
J	Tenderloin	2	1				**3**
X	Out of SF						**0**
Grand Total		**6**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**16**

HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT					PERSON
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	COUNT
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**12.5%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	**31.3%**
D	Mission	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**6.3%**
E	Northern	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**12.5%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	12.5%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**18.8%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	12.5%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**18.8%**
Grand Total		**37.5%**	**56.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**6.3%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 2025

HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY BIAS TYPE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION													PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Anti-Arab	Anti-Asian	Anti-Black or African American	Anti-Hispanic or Latino	Anti-Jewish	Anti-Mental Disability	Anti-Muslim	Anti-Other Christian	Anti-Other Race/Ethnicity	Anti-Physical Disability	Anti-Transgender	Anti-White	Sexual Orientation	
A	Central														**0**
B	Southern		2												**2**
C	Bayview		4												**4**
D	Mission				1					1					**2**
E	Northern				2										**2**
F	Park														**0**
G	Richmond														**0**
H	Ingleside		1		2										**3**
I	Taraval														**0**
J	Tenderloin				1									2	**3**
X	Out of SF														**0**
Grand Total		**0**	**7**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**16**

HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY BIAS TYPE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION													PERSON
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Anti-Arab	Anti-Asian	Anti-Black or African American	Anti-Hispanic or Latino	Anti-Jewish	Anti-Mental Disability	Anti-Muslim	Anti-Other Christian	Anti-Other Race/Ethnicity	Anti-Physical Disability	Anti-Transgender	Anti-White	Sexual Orientation	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**12.5%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**25.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**12.5%**
E	Northern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**12.5%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**18.8%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	**18.8%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**43.8%**	**0.0%**	**37.5%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**6.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**12.5%**	**100.0%**

HATE CRIME - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan	Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian	Black	Hispanic or Latin	White	Other	Unknown	
Q1 2024		5	3	4	1	1	1	**15**
Q1 2025	0	7	2	6	0	0	1	**16**
Difference	0	2	-1	2	-1	-1	0	**1**
% Change	**not calc**	**40.0%**	**-33.3%**	**50.0%**	**-100.0%**	**-100.0%**	**0.0%**	**6.7%**

HATE CRIME - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2024		4	2	5	2	1	1	**15**
Q1 2025	**6**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**16**	**3**	**16**
Difference	6	5	-2	-5	-1	15	2	**1**
% Change	**not calc**	**125.0%**	**-100.0%**	**-100.0%**	**-50.0%**	**1500.0%**	**200.0%**	**6.7%**

HATE CRIME- Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2024	3	11			1	**15**
Q1 2025	6	9	0	0	1	**16**
Difference	3	-2	0	0	0	**1**
% Change	**100.0%**	**-18.2%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**0.0%**	**6.7%**

HATE CRIME - Q1 2024 VS 2025 - VICTIM COUNT BY BIAS TYPE

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION												PERSON COUNT
	Anti-Arab	Anti-Asian	Anti-Black or African American	Anti-Hispanic or Latino	Anti-Jewish	Anti-Mental Disability	Anti-Muslim	Anti-Other Christian	Anti-Other Race/Ethnicity	Anti-Physical Disability	Anti-Transgender	Anti-White	Sexual Orientation	
Q1 2024		4	2		1	1			1				6	**15**
Q1 2025	0	7	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	**16**
Difference	0	3	-2	6	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-4	**1**
% Change	**not calc**	**75.0%**	**-100.0%**	**not calc**	**-100.0%**	**-100.0%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**0.0%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**-66.7%**	**6.7%**

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); Entezari, Mehran (BOS)
Subject: FW: Office of Small Business Annual Report FY2024-25
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 5:19:00 PM
Attachments: OSB_FY24-25_Annual_Report.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached annual report from the Office of Small Business.

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: Tang, Katy (ECN) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, August 1, 2025 4:35 PM
To: Tang, Katy (ECN) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>
Subject: Office of Small Business Annual Report FY2024-25

Supervisors, Legislative Aides, and Board Clerk's Office --

Pursuant to the San Francisco Administrative Code, please find the Office of Small Business Annual Report for FY2024-25 here.

Wishing you all a wonderful and restful legislative recess!

Katy

--
Katy Tang
Executive Director
San Francisco Office of Small Business
628-652-4980 | sf.gov/OSB

General support: City Hall, Room 140
Permit assistance: 49 South Van Ness, 2nd Floor

Sign up for our small business newsletters

SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS

Annual Report

FY2024-25

About us

Our mission

To equitably support, preserve, and protect small businesses in San Francisco. We provide high quality direct services and programs, drive practical policy solutions, and serve as a champion for San Francisco's diverse small business community.

Strategic priorities

01 Support small business retention and growth

02 Attract new small businesses by making it easier and faster to open in San Francisco

03 Strengthen economic vibrancy in neighborhood commercial corridors and economic core

Message from City leaders

Mayor Daniel Lurie

"The future of San Francisco depends on the strength of our small businesses, and our administration is working every day to make it easier for them to open and succeed. We are making the city's permitting process more transparent and accountable, cutting red tape for small businesses, and standing up new entertainment zones that bring energy to our neighborhoods so small businesses across San Francisco can thrive."

Cynthia Huie

Small Business Commission President

"Small businesses are transformational – weaving cultures, people, and experiences together through daily encounters and lasting memories. San Francisco's communities are vibrant and resilient, offering us the power to build businesses that truly reflect our values, cultures, and shared dreams."

Our history

Voters approved three ballot measures that formed the foundation for the functions, services and programs of the Office of Small Business and the Small Business Commission.

2003

Proposition D

Created a chartered Small Business Commission that oversees the Office of Small Business.

2007

Proposition E

Required the Office of Small Business to operate a small business assistance center to help San Francisco businesses with fewer than 100 employees.

2015

Proposition J

Created the Legacy Business Historic Preservation Fund. The Board of Supervisors adopted legislation in 2015 to create the Legacy Business Program.

Our services

The Office of Small Business provides direct services in the following areas:

Business counseling

We provide support with local, state, and federal requirements; connect entrepreneurs to available resources; and provide general guidance for any small business needs.

Leasing support

We help business owners search for a space to open a new business or relocate; review lease agreements; and provide advisement in Letter of Intent and lease negotiations.

Permitting assistance

We have a team of Small Business Permit Specialists to help new and existing business owners navigate the multi-agency permitting journey.

Policy development and advocacy

We collaborate with the Small Business Commission, small business owners, and policymakers in spearheading changes to make it easier to start, run, and grow a business in San Francisco.

Legacy establishment

We support long-standing businesses in San Francisco through marketing, grants, and technical assistance.

Budget

$3.7 million

FY2024-25 budget

The Office of Small Business (OSB) is both a department and a division within the Office of Economic & Workforce Development (OEWD) budget, which manages additional funding for small business support.



*OEWD and OSB host the SF Small Business Development Center (SBDC), which is a program of the U.S. Small Business Administration. SBDCs provide individualized business advising and technical assistance (e.g., marketing, finances/accounting, business plan development) to existing small businesses and pre-venture entrepreneurs. The SF SBDC receives local, state, and federal funding.

Our impact

"The Office of Small Business is such a great resource. They helped [Harper 67] navigate the entire process including permits, paperwork, and grant applications. I started the process in early January and my shop opened on April 18th. I was able to open a brand new business in San Francisco that quickly because of the services they provide."

-Shalyce Benfell
Owner, Harper 67
3044 Fillmore St | harper67.com

Between FY2023-24 and FY2024-25, our office experienced a 29% increase in the number of cases managed

7,496
Total cases managed in FY2024-25

1,150
Number of permitting cases

210
Number of businesses provided leasing support

53
Leases signed with assistance from our office

42% increase from FY2023-24

Business spotlights

Leasing support

Sheba Piano Lounge

1419 Fillmore Street

> "I want to express my heartfelt gratitude for [OSB] stepping in on such short notice to help me and my sister understand our commercial lease renewal within just one day. Your prompt and clear guidance made all the difference."
>
> - co-owner Netsanet Alemayehu

Located in the heart of San Francisco's historical live music district, Sheba Piano Lounge is an intimate bar and lounge where customers can enjoy live music.

The Office of Small Business helped them with the process of renewing their lease.
shebapianolounge.com

The Ruby

3260 19th Street

When the Office of Small Business met The Ruby, they were in a 3,000 Sq. Ft. space for $15K/month. Now, they are saving money and creating additional profit for programming.

The Ruby is a collective of Bay Area nonbinary, transfeminine, and woman-identified creatives. More than just a workspace, The Ruby offers its members opportunities to learn new skills and engage over a communal table of food and drink.
therubysf.com

Who we serve

A review of who we served in FY2024-25 shows a continuing trend where most who seek our help are in the pre-start-up and start-up phase, still engaging in research as they prepare to start a business in San Francisco.

196 Average number of new businesses that register in San Francisco each week (based on rolling 12-month average)

Business stage

55.2% New businesses:
31.3% Start Up phase
23.9% Pre Start Up phase

41.2% Existing businesses:
30.7% Existing business
5.0% Business expansion
2.7% Business acquisition
2.5% Business closure
0.3% Business relocation

Industry

The top 5 industries that seek services from our office include:

1. Hospitality (including food & beverage)
2. Retail
3. Personal Services
4. Healthcare
5. Consulting

Issue area

The top 5 issues our office supported businesses:

1. General counseling
2. Permitting help
3. Business registration
4. Leasing support
5. Finances & Grants

Neighborhood anchors

The Office of Small Business manages the Neighborhood Anchor Business registry, which is for any business that has been in continuous operation in San Francisco for at least 15 years. Businesses 30 years and older are eligible for the Legacy Business Registry.

47 Businesses have signed up to the Neighborhood Anchor Business registry (in operation for 15-29 years)

11 Businesses added to the Registry in FY2024-25

Legacy Businesses

The Legacy Business Program recognizes longstanding, community serving businesses that have been in San Francisco for 30 years or longer. These businesses are valuable cultural assets to the city.

444

Legacy Businesses

54

Businesses added to the Registry in FY2024-25

$920,817

awarded through 49 grants through the Stabilization Grant Programs, an incentive for landlords to enter into long-term leases with Legacy Businesses.



The Gregangelo Museum
gregangelomuseum.com

Legacy Business Spotlight

Fabrix

Located at 432 Clement Street, Fabrix sells upcycled fabric and trims primarily sourced from local San Francisco factories, designers, and manufacturers.

Leveraging the Legacy Business Stabilization Grants, they signed a 10.5 year lease extension, providing over a decade of stability for their business operations.

10.5

Years in their lease extension

-Keelin Reddy, owner of Fabrix
fabrixsanfrancisco.com

Improving accessibility

With funding from the California Disability Access and Education Fund fee, we provide help to businesses working to make their businesses more accessible to customers with disabilities.

Barrier Removal Grants

We provide grants up to $10,000 in reimbursement to business owners for costs associated with making their business more accessible.

$672,387

awarded to small businesses

103

businesses received grants

Beyond the Front Door

With the sunsetting of the SF Accessible Business Entrance program in April 2025, the Office of Small Business has been collaborating with the Office of Disability & Accessibility and Department of Building Inspection on a new initiative: Beyond the Front Door.

The goals of this new initiative include better supporting business owners in understanding how to accommodate customers with diverse needs, as well as improving the customer experience for people with disabilities.

In FY2025-26, we will be launching tools and outreach efforts to better support small businesses in improving accessibility.

Business spotlight

Beck's Motor Lodge

> "I'm incredibly grateful to the Office of Small Business for the $10,000 grant, which helped me make the mandated improvements to my hotel's entrance. The updates have made our business more accessible and welcoming to all guests. While the city's requirements represented a significant financial challenge for a small business like mine, this grant provided meaningful relief and made a real difference."

Beck's Motor Lodge is a Legacy Business located in the Castro. Today, it is now owned and operated by the daughter of the original owner, Brittany Beck, who set out to make improvements to the motel. They received a $10,000 Accessible Barrier Removal grant. Now, their entryway has a handrail, power door operator, and disabled parking to ensure that customers with disabilities are able to patronize the business.

Fire Disaster Relief

When businesses experience a fire that significantly impacts their operations, the Office of Small Business reaches out. We offer grants of up to $10,000 to help them recover and reopen.

$110,000
awarded to small businesses

14
businesses received a grant

Thai Curry Restaurant

96 McAllister St

They reopened in June 2025, nearly a year following a major fire disaster that started in the residences above them. This led to well over $100,000 in damages and a long recovery and rebuild. Our office provided them a $10,000 Fire Disaster Relief Grant and technical assistance.

Venezia Upholstery

311 West Portal Ave

They were able to move back to their original location after a fire impacted six commercial storefronts in the area. The Office of Small Business provided them a $10,000 Fire Disaster Relief Grant to offset additional costs associated with their recovery.

Business tax and license fee reform

San Francisco voters approved Proposition M in November 2024, which will comprehensively restructure the City's business tax system. Businesses will see changes in 2026.

As a result of Proposition M, the City will be able to provide $10 million in relief to small businesses annually by waiving certain license fees.

Plus, the Small Business Exemption ceiling was raised to $5 million (based on SF annual gross receipts).

The Office of Small Business collaborated with the Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector on the companion legislation to eliminate annual license fees (starting with the 2026 bill) for approximately 91% of restaurants and 87% of nightlife businesses.

sftreasurer.org/PropM

Impacts from tax & fee reform

Restaurants

91%

will no longer receive a license bill

$1,400

saved each year on average for a mid-sized restaurant

$5.1M

annual savings expected industry-wide

Nightlife

87%

will no longer receive a license bill

$850

saved each year on average for a typical bar/club

$675,000

annual savings expected industry-wide

First Year Free

San Francisco's First Year Free program waives the initial business registration and permit fees to support new and expanding businesses. The Office of Small Business worked with the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector to extend the program through June 30, 2026

Since 2021

11,000
businesses have benefited

$5,954,451
in fees waived

FY24-25*

2,900
businesses benefited

$2,121,202
in fees waived

*from July 1, 2024-May 31, 2025

Business spotlights

First Year Free program

Regalito El Mil Amores

3481 18th St

"When I opened my first restaurant, First Year Free saved the business $11,000 and was part of the success of El Mil Amores. This year, we opened our second location and once again benefited from the program. Between First Year Free, permitting help, and grant support, I've been able to grow my business in San Francisco."

- Andrea Alfaro

Motoring Coffee

1525 Union St

"It was great to learn about the City's First Year Free program, which ended up helping our business enormously. Through the program, the City waived $14k in fees. It was really helpful to have that savings, and it's a great program to offer to new businesses in San Francisco."

- Tyler Rose

Leland Avenue

The Office of Small Business collaborated with Supervisor Walton and the Leland Avenue Merchants Circle to formally establish Leland Avenue as a Neighborhood Commercial District in the Planning Code. Working closely with community, Supervisor Walton passed legislation defining land use controls for the corridor that reflect their specific needs and priorities.



"This designation is about more than just business—it's about community. We've poured our hearts into making this street a place where people want to shop, eat, and gather. Now, we finally have the structure in place to keep that momentum going."

- Ken McCord
co-owner, Mission Blue
144 Leland St

Policy

Change of Use

Simplified permitting requirements

The Office of Small Business worked with the Department of Building Inspection to pass legislation codifying an existing pilot program to exempt certain small businesses undergoing a change of use from requiring architectural plans.

Our permitting staff noticed that architectural drawings were being required even in cases where no physical changes were being made to businesses, costing them time and money.

If a restaurant, for example, added a beer and wine license, they would technically become a new use, triggering architectural drawings, even though no construction is involved.



sf.gov/CU-No-Plans

PermitSF

PermitSF, an initiative stemming from Mayor Lurie's first Executive Directive, is reforming the City's permitting process to make it customer-centric, fast, predictable, transparent, and unified.

The Office of Small Business is part of the leadership team that are driving meaningful reforms by making structural changes.

Priority areas

01 **Customer experience**: An entrepreneur should be able to easily obtain permits on their own, with visibility into requirements and completion

02 **Government accountability**: Performance metrics should be measurable and aligned with staff goals

03 **Technology**: Tools should be unified and easy for the public to use

sf.gov/PermitSF

PermitSF

Policy

As part of the PermitSF leadership team, the Office of Small Business collaborated with Mayor Lurie and permitting agencies on a package of legislative changes, including:



Eliminating permits and fees for sidewalk tables and chairs, and sidewalk merchandise displays

Each year, over 500 businesses apply for these permits, which can cost a small business between $300 and $2,500 annually. Removing this requirement would save small businesses both time and money, allowing them to focus resources on serving customers and growing their operations.

Reducing the permit processing timelines by eliminating unnecessary steps in the permit review process for entertainment uses

Businesses won't need approval from the Department of Building Inspection on permits to extend their hours or from Planning Department for limited live performance permits, among others. In FY2024-25, about 60 of these permits costs applicants about a month each of processing time and $12,000 in aggregate.



Removing permit requirements and fees for many common business signs

Small business owners will not need to obtain a permit and pay the City to paint the name of their business on their façade or put up a small sign in their window or inside, saving businesses hours of time at the Permit Center and several hundred dollars.

sf.gov/PermitSF

PermitSF

Legislation, continued

Making it possible for business owners to legalize their existing security gates

Integrating security gates into an existing amnesty program for storefront awnings and signs and relaxing transparency requirements for security gate design will ensure that small business owners are not punished for trying to keep their businesses safe.

Eliminating minor encroachment permits for routine tenant improvements

If a business owner installs a door opener to improve accessibility, they no longer will have to pay a nearly $2,000 one-time fee plus an annual fee to the City.

> “The awning and signage amnesty program is a practical and fair measure. Many of us inherit older spaces with unpermitted features; the chance to legalize them without excessive redesign or fines allows us to focus on running our businesses, keeping our staff employed, and enhancing neighborhood character.”
>
> - Alli Goldenberg
> Mariposas Restaurant | 825 Mission St

sf.gov/PermitSF

ShopDineSF

ShopDineSF is the City's ongoing campaign to support businesses in San Francisco.

- **We grew ShopDineSF by collaborating with Moscone Center in curating pop-ups during conventions, providing attendees a flavor of San Francisco through local makers.**
- **The 2025 Small Business Week Pop-Up Shop at City Hall was the most well-attended since its inception.**

430
shoppers

56
makers

Starting FY2025-26, the Office of Economic and Workforce Development will be managing ShopDineSF.

sf.gov/ShopDineSF

@ShopDineSF

Our team

Small Business Commission

Cynthia Huie President
Miriam Zouzounis Vice President
Ron Benitez
Dimitri Cornet
Lawanda Dickerson
Rachel Herbert
William Ortiz-Cartagena

Office of Small Business

Katy Tang Executive Director
Hao Banh Permit Specialist
Kerry Birnbach Senior Policy Analyst/Commission Secretary
Carol Cheng Business Services Manager
Divine Katoure Commercial Leasing Advisor
Richard Kurylo Legacy Business Program Manager
Iris Lee Commercial Leasing Specialist
Rachel Leong Permit Specialist
Walter Monge Case Manager & Neighborhood Anchor Business Coordinator
Michelle Reynolds Programs & Communications Manager
Marianne Thompson Engagement Specialist
Martha Yañez Business Services Manager

Former staff during FY2024-25
Regina Dick-Endrizzi Strategic Initiative
Morgan Heller Permit Specialist

SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS

General assistance:
City Hall, Room 140

Permit assistance:
Permit Center, 49 S Van Ness

sf.gov/osb

sfosb@sfgov.org

415-554-6134

Item 13

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: Minutes of the ISCOTT Hearing on July 24
Date:	Monday, August 4, 2025 1:12:00 PM
Attachments:	ISCOTT_1597_Minutes.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the SFMTA, submitting minutes for the July 24, 2025, ISCOTT meeting.

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: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Sent: Monday, August 4, 2025 12:32 PM
To: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Subject: Minutes of the ISCOTT Hearing on July 24

Good morning –

Attached are the minutes of the July 24 ISCOTT public hearing.

If you have any questions, please let us know.

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

Nick Chapman
Manager, Special Events / Temporary Street Closures
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

1 South Van Ness Ave, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Pronouns: he/him, they/them

ISCOTT MINUTES

INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE
ON TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION FOR
TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES

Meeting of July 24, 2025 - Thursday, 9:00 AM
1597th Regular Meeting
Online Meeting

COMMITTEE	***REPRESENTATIVE***
SFMTA	Bryant Woo (Chair)
SFPD	Capt. Bernadette Robinson, Sgt. Eric Elias, Off. Ronald Quock, Off. Nicole Ramirez, Off. Loren Chiu
SFFD	Lt. Erin Yamamura, Insp. Mary Callahan Capt. Dennis Sy, Insp. Brandon Murray
Public Health	Aron Wong
Public Works	Absent
Entertainment Commission	Dylan Rice
Planning	Absent

DEPARTMENTS	***REPRESENTATIVE***
SFMTA Special Events	Dianne Yee, Elizabeth Hsu
SFMTA Transit	Leslie Bienenfeld, Helen Kwan, Leo Masic
SFMTA Enforcement	James Sarracino
SFMTA Temporary Signs	Gretchen Rude, Houston Forrester, Gary Chau, Sean Muneno, Bradley Wilkinson
SFMTA Taxis	Scott Leon
Emergency Management	Leo Ishoda

GUESTS	***ITEM***	***GUESTS***	***ITEM***
Mark Jennings	Q	Steven Restivo	Q
Sarah Meike	K	Brad Kurtz	T
Tom Murphy	J	Rasheq Zarif	I
Tina Paul		Teddy Kramer	H
Jolene Linsangan	P	Chris Carrington - CG Events	U
Jordan Fetanatnia	P	Rose - 111 Minna Gallery	C
Barry Taranto		Michelle Delaney	C
Savannah Schoelen		Ha Kwan	V
Frank Gonzalez	M	Adrienne Horn	

Lori Karna		Chine (SOMA West CBD)	R
Nessa Rodriguez		Ariel Vaughan	
Alex Ludlum (SOMA West CBD)	R	Thompson, Marianne (ECN)	
Nick Sarno		Abby Landis	

MINUTES OF THE JULY 10, 2025, MEETING (ACTION ITEM)
The Committee adopted the Minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT
There was no public comment.

These proposed actions are an Approval Action as defined by S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 31.

CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Surrey Street between Swiss Avenue and Van Buren Street
Day, September 27, 2025, 1 pm to 9 pm
Block Party - Surrey Street

APPROVED (5-0)

B. Java Street between Buena Vista Avenue West and Masonic Avenue
Sunday, September 28, 2025, 10 am to 6 pm
Block Party - Java Street

APPROVED (5-0)

C. Minna Street between 2nd and New Montgomery streets
Sunday, September 14, 2025, 6 am to
Thursday, September 18, 2025, 11:59 pm
111 Minna - Salesforce

WITHDRAWN

REGULAR CALENDAR

D. Bache Street between Crescent and Benton avenues
Sunday, September 7, 2025, 1 pm to 5 pm
Block Party - Bache Street Civic Space

HELD OVER

E. Kirkham Street between 47th and 48th avenues
Sunday, August 24, 2025, 1 pm to 9 pm
Block Party - Kirkham Street

HELD OVER

F. Arlington Street between Natick and Roanoke streets
Saturday, September 13, 2025, 12 pm to 6 pm
Block Party - Arlington St

APPROVED (5-0)

G. Storrie Street between 18th and Market streets
Sunday, August 24, 2025, 9:30 am to 5 pm
Block Party - Upper Market

APPROVED (5-0)

H. Rossi Avenue between Anza Street and Turk Boulevard
Saturday, September 20, 2025, 8 am to 6 pm
Block Party - Rossi Avenue

APPROVED (5-0)

I. Divisadero Street between Duboce Avenue and 14th Street
Sunday, October 19, 2025, 11 am to 7 pm
Block Party - Buena Vista

APPROVED (5-0)

J. Harrington Street between Mission Street and 150' west of Mission Street
Friday, August 1, 2025, 10 am to 1 pm
Jerry Garcia Street Naming

APPROVED (5-0)

K. Page Street between Octavia and Gough street
Saturday, September 20, 2025, 8 am to 4:30 pm
Compass Clara House 30th Anniversary

WITHDRAWN

L. Keith Street between Armstrong and Carroll avenues
Intersection(s) closed: Keith Street and Bancroft Avenue
Saturday, August 2, 2025, 7 am to 7 pm
Gospel Festival

WITHDRAWN

M. Balmy Street between 24th and 25th streets
Saturday, September 27, 2025, 12 pm to 10:30 pm
Wedding Reception for Frank & Jess

APPROVED (5-0) PENDING FINAL FIRE DEPT. APPROVAL

N. Powell Street between Green and Vallejo streets
Thursday, October 9, 2025, 2 pm to 10 pm
American Legion Cathay Post 384 Fleet Week Block Party

HELD OVER

O. Gilman Avenue between Griffith Street and Bill Walsh Way
Sunday, August 17, 2025, 10 am to 6 pm
Hot August Nights San Francisco

APPROVED (5-0) PENDING FINAL SFMTA, SFPD APPROVAL

P. Harrison Street between 15th and 16th streets; Treat Avenue between 15th and Harrison streets
Intersections closed: Treat avenue at 15th and Harrison streets
Saturday, September 6, 2025, 12 pm to 11 pm
SF Sapphic Pride

APPROVED (5-0)

Q. Polk Street between Pacific Avenue and Broadway
Saturday, September 13, 2025, 7 am to 10 pm
Shanghai Kelly's 40th Anniversary Celebration

APPROVED (5-0)

R. Folsom Street, southernmost parking and bicycle lane only, between Langton and Hallam streets (bicycle lane to remain open and be detoured around the closure)

Thursday, July 24, 2025, through
Thursday, September 25, 2025
3 pm to 11 pm, every second and fourth Thursday of each month
SOMA Nights

APPROVED (5-0)

S. 24 Street between Folsom and Bryant streets; Lucky Street between 24th and 25th streets; Treat Street between 23rd and 25th streets; Balmy Street between 24th and 25th streets; Harrison Street between 23rd and 25th streets; Alabama Street between 23rd and 25th streets; Florida Street between 23rd and 25th streets
Intersections closed: 24th Street at Lucky, Treat, Balmy, Harrison, Alabama and Florida streets

Saturday, September 13, 2025, 8 am to 8 pm
Fiesta de las Américas 2025

HELD OVER

T. Howard Street between Third and Fourth streets; Howard Street (southernmost travel lane and parking lane only) between Hawthorne and Third streets; Third Street (westernmost 2 lanes) between Folsom and Howard streets; Third Street (westernmost lane) between Howard and Mission streets; Folsom Street (northernmost travel lane and parking lane) between Third and Fourth streets; Fourth Street(easternmost travel lane) between Howard and Folsom; streets

Friday, September 12, 2025, 12:01 am to
Saturday, September 20, 2025, 4 pm
Workday Rising 2025 Event

Fourth Street (easternmost travel lane) between Minna and Howard streets

Thursday, September 11, 2025, 10:30 pm to
Friday, September 12, 2025, 2 am
and
Thursday, September 18, 2025, 10:30 pm to
Friday, September 19, 2025, 2 am
K-rail install/removal for Workday Rising 2025

Third Street (westernmost travel lane and parking lane only) between Howard and Folsom streets

Thursday, September 11, 2025, 10:30 pm to
Friday, September 12, 2025, 2 am
and
Thursday, September 18, 2025, 10:30 pm to
Friday, September 19, 2025, 2 am
K-rail install/removal for Workday Rising 2025

APPROVED (5-0)

U. Castro Street between 16th and 19th streets; Market Street between Noe and Diamond streets; 17th Street between Hartford and Castro streets; 18th Street between Noe and Diamond streets; Hartford Street between 17th and 19th streets; Collingwood Street between 19th and Market streets. Intersections closed: 17th Street at Castro Market; 18th Street at Collingwood, Castro and Hartford

Sunday, October 5, 2025, 2 am to 10 pm
Castro Street Fair 2025

APPROVED (5-0)

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

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.

V. Harrison Street between 14th and 15th streets; Alameda Street between Harrison Street and Treat Avenue; Treat Avenue between Division St/Florida St and Alameda St; Alabama Street between Treat Avenue and 15th Street; 15th Street between Harrison and Alabama streets; Treat Avenue between Alabama St and 16th St/Harrison St

Saturday, September 6, 2025, through
Saturday, September 5, 2026
8 am to 8 pm, first Saturday of each month
Stuff by Luxe – Shared Space

Recommended for referral to the SFMTA Board (5-0) with amended start date of Saturday, October 4, 2025

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS ARE AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW AT THE MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY'S OFFICES, ONE SOUTH VAN NESS, SAN FANCISCO, CA 94103, DURING NORMAL BUSINESS HOURS. PLEASE CONTACT TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES 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.

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: ISCOTT Hearing on Thursday, 8/14/25 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:36:00 AM
Attachments:	ISCOTT_1598_Agenda 2025-08-14.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from SFMTA submitting a corrected agenda for the August 14, 2025, ISCOTT meeting.

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: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 7, 2025 4:00 PM
To: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Subject: Re: ISCOTT Hearing on Thursday, 8/14/25 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests

Corrected agenda is attached.

From: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 7, 2025 15:12
Cc: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Subject: ISCOTT Hearing on Thursday, 8/14/25 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests

Hello–

Attached is the agenda for the upcoming ISCOTT hearing on Thursday, August 14, 2025.

If you have any questions, please email us.

Thank you,
Dianne Yee
Transportation Planner III, Special Events – Shared Spaces
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
1 South Van Ness Ave, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

ISCOTT AGENDA

INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE
ON TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION FOR
TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES

Meeting of August 14, 2025 - Thursday, 9:00 AM
1598th 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 JULY 24, 2024, 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. Kirkham Street between 47th and 48th avenues
Sunday, August 24, 2025, 10 am to 6 pm
Block Party - Kirkham Street

B. 28th Ave between Lincoln Way and Irving street
Saturday, September 13, 2025, 9 am to 9 pm
Block Party – 52nd Annual 28th Ave

C. Connecticut Street between 20th and 22nd streets
Saturday, September 20, 2025, 11 am to 4 pm
Block Party - Connecticut St Deadenders

D. Woodland Avenue between Willard Street and Parnassus Avenue
Sunday, September 28, 2025, 11:30 am to 5 pm
Block Party – Woodland Ave

E. 7th Avenue between California and Lake streets
Sunday, October 19, 2025, 9 am to 5 pm
Block Party - 27th Annual 7th Ave

F. Beaver Street between Noe and Castro streets
Saturday, October 25, 2025, 11:30 am to 4:30 pm
Block Party – Beaver Street

G. Dellbrook Avenue between Olympia Way and Olympia Way
Friday, October 31, 2025, 5:30 pm to 8:30 pm
Block Party - Dellbrook Ave

H. Page Street between Octavia and Gough streets
Saturday, September 20, 2025, 11 am to 7 pm
Compass Clara House 30th Anniversary

I. Minna Street between 2nd and New Montgomery streets
Sunday, October 12, 2025, 6 am to
Thursday, October 16, 2025, 11:59 pm
111 Minna – Salesforce

J. Terry A Francois Blvd between Illinois and 16th streets (local access only southbound)
Wednesday, September 3, 2025, 2 pm to 11 pm
JP Morgan Corporate Challenge - Extension

REGULAR CALENDAR

K. Balmy Street between 24th and 25th streets
Saturday, August 16, 2025, 1 pm to 10 pm
Block Party - Balmy St Neighbor Meet and Greet

L. Bache Street between Crescent and Benton avenues
Sunday, September 7, 2025, 1 pm to 5 pm
Block Party - Bache Street Civic Space

M. 18th Avenue between Moraga and Lawton streets
Saturday, September 13, 2025, 9 am to 5 pm
Block Party - 18th Ave

N. Broderick Street between California and Pine streets
Sunday, September 14, 2025, 1 pm to 7 pm
Block Party – Broderick Street

O. El Sereno Court between Rio Court and easterly terminus
Saturday, September 20, 2025, 11 am to 6 pm
Block Party - El Sereno

P. Avila Street between Beach and Prado streets
Sunday, September 21, 2025, 10 am to 6 pm
Block Party – Avila Street

Q. Sanchez Street between Clipper and 26th streets
Sunday, September 7, 2025, 12 pm to 6 pm
Sanchez Summer Fun

R. Keith Street between Armstrong and Carroll avenues
Intersection closed: Keith Street and Bancroft Avenue
Saturday, October 25, 2025, 7 am to 7 pm
Gospel Festival

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

T. Powell Street between Green and Vallejo streets
Thursday, October 9, 2025, 2 pm to 10 pm
American Legion Cathay Post 384 Fleet Week Block Party

U. Madera Street between Wisconsin and Arkansas streets
Saturday, August 16, 2025, 8 am to 6 pm
Potrero Hill Day on the Green Family Day

V. Fair Oaks Street between 24th and 25th streets
Sunday, August 17, 2025, 9 am to 6 pm
Fair Oaks Family Fest

W. Caine Avenue between Lakeview Avenue and northern terminus
Sunday, August 17, 2025, 8 am to 4 pm
M Stop Back to School Backpack Drop

X. Page Street between Steiner and Pierce streets
Saturday, August 23, 2025, 9 am to 3 pm
Page Slow Street Party

Y. Fern Street between Polk and Larkin streets
Saturday, September 6, 2025, 10 am to 9 pm
Fundraiser Event

Z. Alabama Street between 19th and 20th streets
Sunday, September 7, 2025, 8 am to 6:30 pm
Mercadito Los Recuerdos

AA. Polk Street between Green and Union streets
Sunday, September 14, 2025, 10 am to 10 pm
Bar Iris Block Party

BB. Grant Avenue between Clay and Washington streets; Waverly Place between Washington and Sacramento streets; Wentworth Place between Jackson and Washington streets; Ross Alley between Jackson and Washington streets
(Intersection of Clay Street at Waverly Place to remain open.)
Saturday, September 13, 2025, 9 am to 11 pm
Super Flex: Powered by Alter Egos & Shadow Selves

CC. Grant Avenue between California and Broadway streets; Commercial Street between Kearny Street and Grant Avenue; Waverly Place between Washington and Clay streets; Washington Street between Stockton Street and Wentworth Place; Wentworth Place between Jackson and Washington streets
Intersections closed: Grant Avenue at Commercial; Washington Street at Ross, Waverly, and Grant
Friday, September 26, 2025, 10 pm to
Sunday, September 28, 2025, 10:30 pm
35th Annual Autumn Moon Festival

DD. Grant Avenue between Green and Vallejo streets
Sunday, August 31, 2025, 2 pm to 10 pm
Hot August Nights Chili Cook Off

EE. 24th Street between Folsom and Bryant streets; Lucky Street between 24th and 25th streets; Treat Street between 23rd and 25th streets; Balmy Street between 24th and 25th streets; Harrison Street between 23rd and 25th streets; Alabama Street between 23rd and 25th streets; Florida Street between 23rd and 25th streets
Intersections closed: 24th Street at Lucky, Treat, Balmy, Harrison, Alabama and Florida streets
Saturday, September 13, 2025, 8 am to 8 pm
Fiesta de las Américas 2025

FF. 24th Street between Sanchez and Vicksburg streets
Tuesday, August 26, 2025, 2:30 pm to 10 pm
Noe Valley Night Market

GG. Irving Street between 20th and 23rd avenues
Friday, September 26, 2025, 3 pm to 11 pm
Sunset After Dark

HH. King Street between 2nd and 3rd streets; Berry Street between 3rd and 5th streets
Intersection closed: Berry Street at 4th street
Wednesday, September 17, 2025, 12 pm to 11:59 pm
Workday Rising Concert

II. Harlan Place between Grant Avenue and Mark Lane
Saturday, August 30, 2025, 8 am to
Sunday, August 31, 2025, 8 pm
Harlan Records "Leftovers Weekend"

JJ. Ellis Street between Powell and Stockton streets
(Intersection of Ellis and Powell and crosswalks to remain unobstructed at all times)
Thursday, August 21, 2025, 10 am to
Friday, August 22, 2025, 5 am
and
Thursday, September 18, 2025, 10 am to
Friday, September 19, 2025, 5 am
and
Thursday, October 16, 2025, 10 am to
Friday, October 17, 2025, 5 am
and
Thursday, November 20, 2025, 10 am to
Friday, November 21, 2025, 5 am
and
Thursday, December 18, 2025, 10 am to
Friday, December 19, 2025, 5 am
Third Thursdays on Ellis

KK. 16th Street between Terry A Francois Blvd (northernmost parking lane) and Illinois Street

Thursday, September 11, 2025, 12:01 am to
Tuesday, September 23, 2025, 11:59 pm
(Office and restroom trailers, employee shuttle)

Warriors Way between 3rd Street and Terry A Francois Blvd; Bridgeview Way between Warriors Way and Mission Bay Boulevard South

Thursday, September 18, 2025, through
Sunday, September 21, 2025
2 hours prior to event start time, to 1 hour after event end time, daily

16th Street between 3rd Street and Terry A Francois Blvd; Illinois Street between 16th and Mariposa streets

Friday, September 19, 2025, through
Sunday, September 21, 2025
2 hours prior to event start time, to 1 hour after event end time, daily

Terry A Francois Blvd between Warriors Way and 16th Street (westernmost curb lane, westernmost southbound travel lane, and easternmost curb lane only)

Thursday, September 18, 2025, 12:01 am to
Sunday, September 21, 2025, 11:59 pm
(VIP and private shuttle staging)

Terry A Francois Blvd from 16th Street to 50 feet southerly (westernmost parking lane only)

Friday, September 19, 2025, through
Sunday, September 21, 2025
10 am to 11:59 pm, daily
(Relocated taxi zone)

Terry A Francois Blvd from 16th Street to 150 feet southerly (easternmost parking lane only)

Friday, September 19, 2025, through
Sunday, September 21, 2025
8 am to 11:59 pm, daily
(Shuttle staging)

3rd Street (northbound) between 16th Street and Warriors Way

Friday, September 19, 2025, through
Sunday, September 21, 2025
2 hours prior to event start time, to 1 hour after event end time, daily
Laver Cup San Francisco

LL. Terry A Francois Blvd between Warriors Way and 16th Street
Monday, October 13, 2025, 12:01 am to
Thursday, October 16, 2025, 5 am

3rd Street between Warriors Way and Mission Bay Blvd South; Warriors Way between Terry A Francois Blvd and 3rd Street; 16th St between Terry A Francois Blvd and 3rd Street; 4th Street between 16th Street and Mission Bay Blvd South
Wednesday, October 15, 2025, 3 pm to 11 pm
Dreamfest 2025

MM. Howard Street (most southerly travel lane and southernmost parking lane) between Hawthorne and 3rd streets; 3rd Street (west #1 and #2 lanes) between Folsom and Howard streets; 3rd Street (westernmost travel/tow away lane) between Howard and Mission streets; Folsom Street (northernmost travel lane and parking lane) between 3rd and 5th streets; 4th Street (easternmost travel lane) between Howard and Folsom streets
Sunday, October 5, 2025, 12:01 am to
Sunday, October 19, 2025, 10 pm

Howard Street between 3rd and 4th streets
Sunday, October 5, 2025, 6 am to
Sunday, October 19, 2025, 10 pm
Dreamforce Campus

4th Street (2 easterly thru travel lanes) between Minna and Folsom streets
Sunday, October 12, 2025, 10 pm to
Thursday, October 19, 2025, 10 pm
and
4th Street between Mission and Howard streets; Howard Street (northernmost travel and parking lanes) between 4th Street and 540' west; Howard Street (southernmost parking and two travel lanes) between 5th and 4th streets; Minna Street between 4th Street and approx. 550' west [driveway for Intercontinental]
(Muni and Dreamforce shuttles only to be allowed on 4th Street)
Monday, October 13, 2025, 6 am to 8 pm
Tuesday, October 14, 2025, 6 am to 8 pm
Wednesday, October 15, 2025, 6 am to 8 pm
Thursday, October 16, 2025, 6 am to 8 pm
Dreamforce Campus/Pedestrian Safety

Howard Street (parking lane and most northerly travel lane) between 4th

Street and 50 feet past Moscone West loading dock to the west
Tuesday, October 14, 2025, 6 am to 9:30 am
Tuesday, October 14, 2025, 5 pm to 7:30 pm
Wednesday, October 15, 2025, 6 am to 9:30 am
Wednesday, October 15, 2025, 3 pm to 9 pm
Thursday, October 19, 2025, 6 am to 9:30 am
Dreamforce Hotel Shuttle Service

4th Street (most westerly travel lane) between Minna and Howard streets;
4th Street (most easterly travel lane) between Mission and Folsom streets
(At least two traffic lanes of 4th Street to remain unobstructed at all times)
Sunday, October 4, 2025, 10 pm to
Monday, October 5, 2025, 4 am
and
Thursday, October 16, 2025, 10 pm to
Friday, October 17, 2025, 4 am
and
3rd Street (most westerly travel lane) between Mission and Folsom streets
Sunday, October 4, 2025, 10 pm to
Monday, October 5, 2025, 4 am
and
Thursday, October 16, 2025, 10 pm to
Friday, October 17, 2025, 4 am
Dreamforce Moscone – Sidewalk K-rail installation/removal

Dreamforce 2025

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.

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 Thu, August 28 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests
Date:	Thursday, August 21, 2025 10:12:33 AM
Attachments:	ISCOTT_1599_Agenda.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached, from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), submitting the agenda for the August 28, 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: Thursday, August 21, 2025 9:02 AM
To: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Subject: ISCOTT Hearing on Thu, August 28 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests

Good morning –

Attached is the agenda for the upcoming ISCOTT hearing on Thursday, August 28.

If you have any questions, please email us.

Nick Chapman

Manager, Special Events / Temporary Street Closures
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 August 28, 2025 - Thursday, 9:00 AM
1599th 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 AUGUST 14, 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. Northwood Drive between Faxon Avenue and Pizarro Way
Saturday, September 6, 2025, 11:00 am to 3 pm
Block Party - Westwood Park Annual Meeting

B. Jordan Avenue between Euclid Avenue and Geary Blvd
Sunday, September 7, 2025, 10 am to 6 pm
Block Party - Jordan Park Summer

C. 41st Avenue between Judah and Kirkham streets
Saturday, September 13, 2025, 8 am to 5 pm
Block Party – 41st Avenue

D. Ord Court between Ord Street and westerly terminus
Saturday, September 13, 2025, 11 am to 7 pm
Block Party – Ord Court

E. Washington Street between Locust and Laurel streets
Sunday, September 14, 2025, 10 am to 6 pm
Block Party - Washington Street

F. 12th Avenue between Lincoln Way and Irving Street
Saturday, September 20, 2025, 10 am to 8 pm
Block Party – 12th Avenue

G. Elsie Street between Cortland and Eugenia avenues
Saturday, September 27, 2025, 10 am to 4 pm
Block Party – Elsie Street

H. Green Street between Broderick and Baker streets
Sunday, September 28, 2025, 10 am to 4:30 pm
Block Party – Green Street

I. Dellbrook Avenue between Olympia Way and Olympia Way
Sunday, September 28, 2025, 9 am to 5 pm
Block Party – Dellbrook Avenue (MTHOA)

J. 2nd Avenue between Lake and California streets
Sunday, October 12, 2025, 10 am to 5 pm
Block Party - 2nd Avenue 100 Block

K. 43rd Avenue between Judah and Kirkham streets
Friday, October 31, 2025, 2 pm to 11 pm
Block Party – 43rd Avenue Trick-or-Treating

L. Ford Street between Noe and Sanchez streets
Saturday, September 13, 2025, 10 am to 5 pm
Block Party – Ford Fest

M. Jordan Ave between California Street and Geary Blvd; Commonwealth Ave between California Street and Geary Blvd
(All intersections to remain open)
Friday, October 31, 2025, 4 pm to 10 pm
Jordan Avenue Halloween

N. Grove Street between Baker Street and Central Avenue; Lyon Street between Fulton and Hayes streets
Intersection closed: Grove Street at Lyon Street
Friday, October 31, 2025, 3 pm to 10 pm
NOPNA Halloween Block Party

O. Steiner St from Duboce Ave to Waller St
Sunday, October 19, 2025, 11 am to 5 pm
Wiggle Fest Fall 2025

REGULAR CALENDAR

P. El Sereno Court between Rio Court and easterly terminus
Saturday, September 20, 2025, 11 am to 6 pm
Block Party - El Sereno

Q. Kansas Street between 20th and 22nd streets
Saturday, September 6, 2025, 11:30 am to 6 pm
Block Party - Kansas Street Dead End Potluck Picnic

R. Mercato Court between Malta Drive and Easterly Terminus
Saturday, September 6, 2025, 11 am to 7 pm
Block Party - MGOA Mercato Ct

S. Coventry Court between Cresta Vista Drive and Coventry Lane
Sunday, September 7, 2025, 11 am to 2 pm
Block Party - Coventry Court

T. Maynard Street between Congdon Street and Gladstone Drive
Saturday, September 20, 2025, 9 am to 2 pm
Block Party - Maynard Street

U. 48th Avenue between Irving Street and Lincoln Way
Saturday, September 27, 2025, 10 am to 2 pm
Block Party - 48th Ave Cozy Corner

V. Larkin Street between Jackson and Washington streets
Saturday, September 27, 2025, 12 pm to 5 pm
Block Party - Hearts on Larkin

W. Chenery Street between Burnside and Chilton avenues
Day, October 4, 2025, 11 am to 6 pm
Block Party - Chenery Street

X. Lily Street between Laguna and Buchanan streets
Sunday, October 5, 2025, 9 am to 3 pm
Block Party - Lily Street Fair

Y. Brentwood Avenue between Valdez and Hazelwood avenues
Saturday, October 11, 2025, 9 am to 5 pm
Block Party - Westwood Highlands

Z. College Avenue between Mission Street and Saint Mary's Avenue
Sunday, October 12, 2025, 11 am to 3:30 pm
Block Party - College Ave 2025

AA. Scott Street between Jefferson Street and Marina Boulevard
Saturday, October 18, 2025, 12 pm to 6:30 pm
Block Party – Scott Street Scottober

BB. Florida Street between 23rd and 24th streets
Saturday, October 25, 2025, 12 pm to 10 pm
Block Party - Florida Street

CC. Minnesota Street between 20th and 22nd streets
Saturday, October 25, 2025, 4 pm to 8 pm
Minnesota Street Spooky Stroll

DD. Carolina Street between Mariposa and 17th streets
Saturday, September 6, 2025, 9 am to 4 pm
Play in Your Park Party

EE. Sunnydale Avenue from Hahn to Sawyer streets
Saturday, September 6, 2025, 8 am to 3 pm
River of Life Prayer Breakfast

FF. Waller Street between Steiner and Scott streets; Pierce Street between Haight Street and southernly terminus; Potomac Street between Waller Street and southernly terminus; Carmelita Street between Waller Street and southernly terminus
Intersections closed: Waller Street at Potomac, Pierce, and Carmelita streets
Friday, October 31, 2025, 5 pm to 9 pm
Waller St Halloween

GG. Taylor Street between Lombard Street and Columbus Ave/Chestnut Street
Saturday, September 20, 2025, 2 pm to 10 pm
Country Summer

HH. 12th Street between Market Street and South Van Ness Avenue
Tuesday, September 16, 2025, 6 am to
Wednesday, September 17, 2025, 1 am
One Source Virtual

II. Elizabeth Street between Diamond and Castro streets
Saturday, September 27, 2025, 8 am to 7 pm
and
Sunday, September 28, 2024, 8 am to 7 pm
St. Philips School Festival

JJ. Minnesota Street between 19th and 20th streets
Saturday, September 27, 2025, 12 pm to 5 pm
Dogpatch Music Series

KK. Vallejo Street between Grant and Columbus avenues
Friday, October 3, 2025, 12 pm to
Monday, October 6, 2025, 6 am
KOSF Canticle of the Creatures

LL. Irving Street between 20th and 22nd avenues
Intersection closed: Irving Street at 21st Avenue
Saturday, October 4, 2025, 9 am to 6 pm
Sunset Autumn Moon Festival & Health Fair

MM. Clement Street between 8th and 11th avenues
Intersections closed: Clement Street at 9th and 10th avenues
Saturday, October 4, 2025, 6 am to 6 pm
Richmond Autumn Moon

NN. 4th Street between Nelson Rising Lane to 16th Street
Saturday, October 25, 2025, 8 am to 10 pm
UCSF Bay Area Science Festival

OO. San Bruno Avenue between 25th Street and San Bruno Avenue
Saturday, September 20, 2025, 9 am to 7 pm
United Against Fentanyl - Walk for Lives SF

PP. Greenwich Street between Filmore and Steiner streets
Sunday, October 19, 2025, 7 am to 9 pm
The PlumpJack Foundation Presents: Balboa Block Party

QQ. Marina Boulevard (westbound travel lanes only) between Scott and Lyon Streets
Sunday, June 7, 2026, 3 am to 4:30 pm
and
El Camino del Mar between Lincoln Boulevard and Lincoln Way
25th, 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th, and 30th Avenues between El Camino del Mar and Lake Street
McLaren Avenue between El Camino del Mar and 28th Avenue;
Clement Street between 34th Avenue and Seal Rock Drive;
34th, 35th, 36th, 37th, 38th, 39th and 40th Avenues between Geary Boulevard and Clement Street
41st, 42nd, 43rd, 44th, and 45th Avenues between Point Lobos Avenue and Clement Street;
Seal Rock Drive between 45th Avenue and El Camino del Mar;
45th Avenue, Alta Mar Way and El Camino del Mar between Point Lobos Avenue and Seal Rock Drive;
Point Lobos Avenue (southbound only) between El Camino del Mar and Great Highway
Note: Local access for residents will be maintained.
Sunday, June 7, 2026, 6 am to 10:30 am
Escape From Alcatraz Triathlon 2026

RR. El Camino Del Mar between Lincoln Hwy (Land's End/Legion of Honor and The Presidio 25th, 26th, 27th, 28th, 30th avenues between El Camino Del Mar and Lake Street; 29th Avenue between El Camino Del Mar and Lake Street; McLaren Avenue between El Camino Del Mar and 28th Ave
and
Marina Blvd between Scott and Lyon streets
Saturday, June 6, 2026, 3 am to 11 am
Escape from Alcatraz Pro Race

SS. Grove Street between Polk and Larkin streets
Friday, September 12, 2025, 7 am to
Saturday, September 13, 2025, 11:59 pm
and
Dr Carlton B Goodlett Place between McAllister and Grove streets
Saturday, September 13, 2025, 1 pm to 8 pm
EMPIRE 15 Concert

TT. 20th Street between Illinois and Georgia streets
Sunday, September 7, 2025, 7 am to 8 pm
and
Tuesday, September 9, 2025, 7 am to 8 pm
Summer 25 Demo Day

UU. 24th Street between Capp and Valencia streets; Lilac Street between 24th and 25th streets
Intersections closed: 24th Street at Orange, Bartlett, Osage, and Lilac streets
Saturday, September 20, 2025, 6 am to 7 pm
SF Lowrider Council King of the Streets Parade

VV. Cesar Chavez Street between 3rd Street and eastern terminus; Marin Street between 3rd Street and eastern terminus; Michigan Street between Cesar Chavez and Marin streets; Illinois Street between Amador and 24th streets;
Saturday, September 20, 2025, 7 am to
Monday, September 22, 2025, 1 am
and
25th Street between 3rd and Michigan streets (Muni only allowed)
Saturday, September 20, 2025, 7 am to
Monday, September 22, 2025, 1 am
and
3rd Street between Cargo Way and 23rd Street (Muni only allowed); Cesar Chavez St between Minnesota and 3rd streets; 23rd and 24th streets between 3rd and Illinois streets; Illinois Street between 22nd and 24th streets
Saturday, September 20, 2025, 8 pm to
Sunday, September 21, 2025, 1 am
and
Sunday, September 21, 2025, 8 pm to
Monday, September 22, 2025, 1 am
Portola Music Festival

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.

WW. Dodge Street between Turk Street and southerly terminus
Thursday, October 9, 2025, through
Friday, October 9, 2026
3 pm to 10 pm, Thursday through Sunday each week
Dodge Place – Shared Space

***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 14

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: Response to LOI re Station Captain Assignments and Turnover
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:13:00 AM
Attachments:	Response to Supervisor Mahmood Station Captain Turnover.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Police Department, submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Bilal Mahmood at the July 15, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting.

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: Coppola, Renee (POL) <renee.coppola@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 10:06 AM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Logan, Samantha (BOS) <sam.logan@sfgov.org>; Lopez, Steven (POL) <steven.lopez1@sfgov.org>
Cc: Yep, Paul (POL) <Paul.Yep@sfgov.org>; Aroche, Diana (POL) <diana.aroche@sfgov.org>; Gamero, Lili (POL) <lili.gamero@sfgov.org>
Subject: Response to LOI re Station Captain Assignments and Turnover

Good morning Madam Clerk,

Please see enclosed the San Francisco Police Department's Letter of Response to Supervisor Mahmood's inquiry regarding Station Captain Assignments and Turnover.

Thank you for your time.

Renee Coppola, Senior Management Assistant
Policy & Public Affairs | San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street, 6th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94158

Direct: 415.575.5860
https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/

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

DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

PAUL YEP
INTERIM CHIEF OF POLICE

August 5th, 2025

Supervisor Bilal Mahmood
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Supervisor Mahmood:

RE: Inquiry regarding station captain assignments and turnover
Please see the information below in response to your letter of inquiry regarding information regarding station Captain assignments and turnover:

1. Over the past five years, how often have Captains been reassigned or replaced at each SFPD district station?

   Response: Please see the attached supplemental chart detailing the frequency of Captain assignments and reassignments across all district stations over the past five years.

2. Does the Department track the reasons for Captain turnover in a centralized or formal way? Are exit interviews conducted? If so, can this data be shared?

   Response: The Department does not conduct exit interviews for reassigned Captains. While there is no formal centralized system and formal documentation of turnover rationale is not required, the Department remains mindful of the impact leadership changes have on both internal operations and community relationships. As such, we strive to make thoughtful and strategic decisions that support continuity, officer wellbeing, and public safety outcomes.

3. Are there any strategies or incentives currently in place to promote longer Captain tenures at a single station?

   Response: The Interim Chief of Police is actively exploring sustainable strategies to support longer tenures for Captains at district stations. One such initiative is the introduction of a pilot of a fifth lieutenant position at select high-volume stations, specifically Central and Mission Station. This structure is designed to alleviate operational pressures on Captains, enhance continuity in community engagement, and mitigate burnout. The lieutenant's role is also focused on sustaining ongoing community partnerships, especially during times of leadership transition.

   This model draws on best practices from departments such as the Los Angeles

Police Department, which utilizes a dual-Captain model. While implementing two Captains per station is not currently feasible in San Francisco due to budgetary and staffing limitations, this pilot approach reflects similar goals and may be expanded to other areas such as Metro and Mid-Market, depending on its effectiveness.

If you have additional questions, please contact me at 415-837-7123, or email to diana.aroche@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

DR. DIANA AROCHE
Director of Policy & Public Affairs

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie
Clarence Clay, President, San Francisco Police Commission

NAME	Station	Start Date	End Date	End Reason	Tenure at station (years)
Ng,Julian W	Central	2/20/21	7/1/22	Promotion	1.36
Kim,Ja Han E	Central	9/2/23	7/5/25	Promotion	1.84
Del Gandio,Christopher E	Central	7/19/25	Current	N/A	
Jones,Nicole H.	Ingleside	2/20/21	11/13/21	Promotion	0.73
Lew,Derrick J	Ingleside	1/29/22	7/8/23	Promotion	1.44
Hurwitz,Amy L	Ingleside	9/2/23	7/19/25	Transfer	1.88
Newbeck,Gerald B	Ingleside	7/19/25	Current	N/A	
Moran,Rachel A	Mission	2/20/21	11/13/21	Promotion	0.73
McEachern,Michael G	Mission	1/29/22	7/1/23	Retired	1.42
Harvey III,Thomas D	Mission	4/15/23	8/17/24	Transfer	1.34
Johansen,Liza Desiree	Mission	8/17/24	6/30/25	Transfer	0.87
Perdomo,Sean P	Mission	7/19/25	Current	N/A	
Jackson,Derrick R	Northern	1/29/22	7/8/23	Promotion	1.44
Sawyer,Jason C	Northern	9/2/23	7/5/25	Promotion	1.84
McCormick,Patrick M	Northern	7/19/25	Current	N/A	
Hart,John M	Park	6/25/22	7/5/25	Promotion	3.03
Wilhelm,Angela M	Park	7/19/25	Current	N/A	
Maron,David S	Bayview	2/20/21	11/11/23	Transfer	2.72
Koniaris,Michael P	Bayview	5/11/24	7/19/25	Transfer	1.19
Robinson,Bernadette	Bayview	7/19/25	Current	N/A	
Caltagirone,Gaetano	Richmond	2/20/21	10/15/22	Transfer	1.65
Canning,Christopher W	Richmond	10/15/22	7/19/25	Transfer	2.76
Lee,Kevin	Richmond	7/19/25	Current	N/A	
Martin,Luke T	Southern	11/26/22	7/5/25	Promotion	2.61
Hurwitz,Amy L	Southern	7/19/25	Current	N/A	
Rainsford,Nicholas D	Taraval	1/23/21	1/29/22	Transfer	1.02
Vintero,Eric	Taraval	1/29/22	7/1/22	Promotion	0.42
Yick,Robert C	Taraval	10/15/22	7/1/23	Retired	0.71
Hoo,Brien G	Taraval	9/2/23	7/5/25	Promotion	1.84
Harmston,Clayton A	Taraval	7/19/25	Current	N/A	
Canning,Christopher W	Tenderloin	2/20/21	10/15/22	Transfer	1.65
Chin,Sergio K	Tenderloin	10/15/22	8/17/24	Transfer	1.84
Sullivan,Matthew D	Tenderloin	7/19/25	Current	N/A	

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

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

July 16, 2025

Paul Yep, Interim Chief of Police
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
Via Email: Paul.Yep@sfgov.org

Dear Interim Chief Yep,

At the July 15, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting, Supervisors Bilal Mahmood, Stephen Sherrill, Danny Sauter, Jackie Fielder, and Shamann Walton issued the attached inquiry to the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD). Please review the attached letter of inquiry, which provides the Supervisor's request.

The inquiry, in summary, requests the following information:

- Over the past five years, how often have captains been reassigned or replaced at each SFPD district station?
    - Please include the name of each captain, their start and end dates, and the reason for their departure (e.g., promotion, reassignment, retirement, etc.), if available.
- Does the SFPD track the reasons for captain turnover in a centralized or formal way? Are exit interviews conducted? If so, can this data be shared?
- Are there any strategies or incentives currently in place to promote longer captain tenures at a single station?
    - If not, what types of approaches might the SFPD consider to encourage greater stability?

Please contact Sam Logan, Sam.Logan@sfgov.org, Legislative Aide for Supervisor Mahmood, 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 30, 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/JA/RL

Attachments:

- Letter of Inquiry
- Introduction Form

Cc: Lisa Ortiz, SFPD, Lisa.Ortiz@sfgov.org
Lili Gamero, SFPD, Lili.Gamero@sfgov.org
Rima Malouf, SFPD, Rima.Malouf@sfgov.org
Steven Lopez, SFPD, Steven.Lopez@sfgov.org
Diana Oliva-Aroche, SFPD, Diana.Aroche@sfgov.org
Sgt. Stacy Youngblood, SFPD, Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org
Carl Nicita, SFPD, Carl.Nicita@sfgov.org

Member, Board of Supervisors

District 5

City and County of San Francisco

BILAL MAHMOOD
馬百樂

July 15, 2025

Dear Interim Chief Yep,

I am writing to understand the San Francisco Police Department's approach to station captain assignments and turnover, particularly given the significant impact these leadership transitions have on neighborhood-level public safety, community relationships, and operational continuity.

Our office frequently hears from residents and community organizations about the importance of consistent leadership at district stations. In this year alone in District 5, we have lost 5 captains across 3 stations. Frequent and unexpected changes in public safety leadership can disrupt long-term problem-solving, community trust, and coordination with local stakeholders. Understanding the frequency and reasoning behind these transitions—and any efforts to improve retention—would help inform how we support stronger neighborhood outcomes.

To that end, we respectfully request information in response to the following questions:

- Over the past five years, how often have captains been reassigned or replaced at each SFPD district station?
    - Please include the name of each captain, their start and end dates, and the reason for their departure (e.g., promotion, reassignment, retirement, etc.), if available.

- Does the Department track the reasons for captain turnover in a centralized or formal way? Are exit interviews conducted? If so, can this data be shared?

- Are there any strategies or incentives currently in place to promote longer captain tenures at a single station?
    - If not, what types of approaches might the Department consider to encourage greater stability?

City Hall, Room 244 • 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place • San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
(415) 554-7630 • Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org

Our goal is to better understand how these decisions are made, how frequently they occur, and what options may exist to support consistent leadership at the station level, particularly in neighborhoods that experience persistent public safety challenges.

We appreciate your time and look forward to working together to strengthen neighborhood public safety efforts across San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Bilal Mahmood
District 5 Supervisor

City Hall, Room 244 • 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place • San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
(415) 554-7630 • Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org

Introduction Form

(by a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor)

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- ☐ 1. For reference to Committee (Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment)
- ☐ 2. Request for next printed agenda (For Adoption Without Committee Reference)
  (Routine, non-controversial and/or commendatory matters only)
- ☐ 3. Request for Hearing on a subject matter at Committee
- ■ 4. Request for Letter beginning with "Supervisor Mahmood inquires…"
- ☐ 5. City Attorney Request
- ☐ 6. Call File No. _____ from Committee.
- ☐ 7. Budget and Legislative Analyst Request (attached written Motion)
- ☐ 8. Substitute Legislation File No. _____
- ☐ 9. Reactivate File No. _____
- ☐ 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the Board on _____

The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following (please check all appropriate boxes):

☐ Small Business Commission ☐ Youth Commission ☐ Ethics Commission

☐ Planning Commission ☐ Building Inspection Commission ☐ Human Resources Department

General Plan Referral sent to the Planning Department (proposed legislation subject to Charter 4.105 & Admin 2A.53):

☐ Yes ☐ No

(Note: For Imperative Agenda items (a Resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Agenda Form.)

Sponsor(s):

Mahmood; Walton, Sherrill, Sauter, Fielder

Subject:

SFPD Captain Turnover Rates

Long Title or text listed:

Inquiry into SFPD Station Captain Turnover and Strategies to Promote Retention and Stronger Neighborhood-Level Public Safety Outcomes

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: /s/ Bilal Mahmood

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: Completed: DocuSign: AIR - BOS FY24-25 Sole Source Contracts.pdf
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 9:32:00 AM
Attachments: Dept 27 Airport Commission BOS Annual Report FY24-25 FINAL.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco International Airport, submitting a report on sole source contracts in Fiscal Year 2024-2025, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 67.24(e).

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: DocuSign System <dse_na2@docusign.net> on behalf of Cynthia Avakian via Docusign <dse_na2@docusign.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 5:03:35 PM
To: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Subject: Completed: DocuSign: AIR - BOS FY24-25 Sole Source Contracts.pdf



Cynthia Avakian
cynthia.avakian@flysfo.com

All parties have completed DocuSign: AIR - BOS FY24-25 Sole Source Contracts.pdf.

Attached is the Airport's sole source report for FY24-25. Thanks, Cynthia

Powered by

Do Not Share This Email
This email contains a secure link to Docusign. Please do not share this email, link, or access code with others.

Alternate Signing Method
Visit Docusign.com, click 'Access Documents', and enter the security code:
7EE5A138CC1E48C0845E08F3A69859922

About Docusign
Sign documents electronically in just minutes. It's safe, secure, and legally binding. Whether you're in an office, at home, on-the-go -- or even across the globe -- Docusign provides a professional trusted solution for Digital Transaction Management™.

Questions about the Document?
If you need to modify the document or have questions about the details in the document, please reach out to the sender by emailing them directly.

Stop receiving this email
Report this email or read more about Declining to sign and Managing notifications.

If you have trouble signing, visit "How to Sign a Document" on our Docusign Support Center, or become part of the Docusign Community to access tips and guidance from peers.

Download the Docusign App

This message was sent to you by Cynthia Avakian who is using the Docusign Electronic Signature Service. If you would rather not receive email from this sender you may contact the sender with your request.

Docusign Envelope ID: 7EF6C3B0-B487-40B2-80D7-0726633CC7D5

SAN FRANCISCO
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Signed by:
Kevin Burn
29E8D141024A43

August 5, 2025

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

SUBJECT: FY24-25 AIR Sole Source Contracts Report

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.24(e), attached is the Airport's report of FY 24-25 sole source contracts.

This report contains requests that were approved by the Airport Director or the City's Office of Contract Administration from July 1, 2024 – June 30, 2025.

If you have any questions, please contact Cynthia Avakian at (650) 821-2014.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
Mike Nakornkhet
F7216F51AF8F4BE...

Mike Nakornkhet
Airport Director

Enclosure(s)

AIRPORT COMMISSION CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DANIEL LURIE MAYOR | **MALCOLM YEUNG** PRESIDENT | **JANE NATOLI** VICE PRESIDENT | **JOSE F. ALMANZA** | **MARK BUELL** | **SUSAN LEAL** | **MIKE NAKORNKHET** AIRPORT DIRECTOR

POST OFFICE BOX 8097 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94128 TEL 650.821.5000 FAX 650.821.5005 **FLYSFO.COM**

Docusign Envelope ID: 7EF6C3B0-B487-40B2-80D7-0726633CC7D5

Dept 27 - Airport Commission - Sole Source Contracts
FY24-25 (July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025)

	Contract ID/ PO No.	Contract/PO Description	Contract Type	Solicitation Waiver ID	Waiver Justification	Total Not-to-Exceed (NTE) Amount	Supplier Name	Supplier ID	Contract Execution/ Amendment/ Novation Date
1	1000031223 / 0000812069	Ct 11431.66 Design Build Services for Recycled Water System Project	Chapter 6	N/A	Airport sole source for grant funding for Sequential Batch Reactor Upgrade for the Advanced Water Treatment Plant	$60,107,421	Walsh Construction Group II, LLC	0000008502	7/2/2024
2	1000015756 / No PO	Ct 9405.71 Services for the Bus Maintenance Facility Project	Chapter 6	N/A	Airport sole source for adding the industrial waste system scope under Ct 9405.71 for the bus maintenance facility project	$2,700,000	Swinerton Builders	0000010117	10/1/2024
3	1000033449 / 0000892246	Ct 50389 GTMS/TMS Support Main	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0010196 - approved on 7/29/24 OCAWVR0010255 - amended on 8/7/24 to increase NTE	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	$2,500,000	Arcadis, A California Partnership	0000038938	1/27/2025
4	1000018747 / 0000766124	Ct 50223 ABM to ABRM	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0010242 - amended on 8/2/24 to extend and increase NTE OCAWVR0007394 - approved on 2/28/23	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	$341,000	GCR, Inc.	0000019685	6/17/2024
5	1000033447 / 0000927127	Ct 50374 Common Use Terminal Eq	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0010505	21.5(b): No Substitute for Project/Service and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	$7,000,000	San Francisco Terminal Equipment Co	0000011505	5/2/2025
6	1000034677 / 0000919530	Ct 50401 VMAT Equipment Maintenance Support	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0010563	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	$395,000	Passur Aerospace Inc	0000013477	4/17/2025
7	0000875687	Firearm Ammunition	REQ 0000309249	OCAWVR0010580	21.16(b): Reciprocal Agreements with Other Public and Non Profit Agencies	$160,939.84	San Diego Police Equipment Co Inc	0000011645	10/16/2024
8	1000034023 / 0000892922	Ct 50387 PPS_IDS	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0010600	21.5(b): No Substitute for Project/Service and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	$2,000,000	SITA Infor Networking Computing USA Inc.	0000030095	12/30/2024
9	0000897830	Fujitsu Manfacturer to replace equipment for boarding and baggage tags	REQ 0000309244	OCAWVR0010650	21.5(b): No Substitute for Project/Service and Only One Source (Bid Required)	$727,771	New Tech Solutions Inc	0000014325	1/13/2025
10	0000890381	EV charging units at SFO Equipment Maintenance and Support	REQ 0000312832	OCAWVR0010684	21.5(b): No Substitute for Project/Service and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	$370,000	ChargePoint Inc	0000023056	12/11/2024

Docusign Envelope ID: 7EF6C3B0-B487-40B2-80D7-0726633CC7D5

Dept 27 - Airport Commission - Sole Source Contracts
FY24-25 (July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025)

	Contract ID/ PO No.	Contract/PO Description	Contract Type	Solicitation Waiver ID	Waiver Justification	Total Not-to-Exceed (NTE) Amount	Supplier Name	Supplier ID	Contract Execution/ Amendment/ Novation Date
11	0000804498	Transmission repair for Aircraft Rescue Fire Fighting vehicle	Purchase Order	OCAWVR0010694 - amended on 10/31/24 to increase amount OCAWVR0009482 - amended on 3/18/24 to correct NTE amount	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (Bid Required)	$26,698.05	A1 Transmission and Marine, INC	0000045455	10/31/2024
12	1000034816 / 0000924431	Ct 50403 TSA Gate Pass	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0010733	21.5(b): No Substitute for Project/Service and only One Source (No Bid Required)	$106,092	Aptaero Inc.	0000054550	4/28/2025
13	1000034949 / No PO	Ct 50263 Fleet & Fuel System	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0010754	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	$800,000.00	AssetWorks Inc	0000025001	Not executed
14	1000034895 / No PO	Ct 12280.44 Radio Equip Maint	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0010761	21.5(b): No Substitute for Project/Service and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	$2,900,000.00	Motorola Solutions, Inc.	0000014752	Not executed
15	1000035083	Ct 50408 software implementation consulting services for ACFR process	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0010810	21.16(c): Solicitations for Multiple Departments	$200,000.00	Deloitte & Touche, LLP	0000042508	Not executed
16	0000939299	FeedbackNow SaaS platform and hardware	REQ	OCAWVR0010833	21.5(b): No Substitute for Project/Service and Only One Source (Bid Required)	$1,259,850	Xtech	0000008003	6/6/2025
17	1000034817 / 0000926486	Ct 50405 Audio/Video Conf Sup	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0010853	21.5(b): No Substitute for Project/Service and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	$1,000,000	Rahi Systems, Inc	0000039331	5/1/2025
18	1000035088 / No PO	Ct 50409 T1 BHS Op/Maint/Rep	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0010870	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	$60,000,000	BEUMER Lifecycle Management LLC	0000040977	Not executed
19	1000035069 / 0000894516	Ct 50225 VMAT Support Maint	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0010935 - amended on 12/24/2024 for assignment/assumption OCAWVR0001448 - approved on 5/16/2019	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	$108,675	Passur Aerospace Inc	0000013477	12/30/2024
20	1000035481 / 0000944674	Ct 50385 VMS Support and Maintenance	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0011079	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	$200,000.00	ReveLux D3 LED, LLC	0000057199	7/7/2025

Docusign Envelope ID: 7EF6C3B0-B487-40B2-80D7-0726633CC7D5

Dept 27 - Airport Commission - Sole Source Contracts
FY24-25 (July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025)

	Contract ID/ PO No.	Contract/PO Description	Contract Type	Solicitation Waiver ID	Waiver Justification	Total Not-to-Exceed (NTE) Amount	Supplier Name	Supplier ID	Contract Execution/ Amendment/ Novation Date
21	0000929923	Synect Manufacturer for TM3 Synect renewal and as-needed services	REQ 0000324261	OCAWVR0011256	21.5(b): No Substitute for Project/Service and Only One Source (Bid Required)	$520,186.52	Axelliant, LLC	0000053020	5/12/2025
22	1000035745 / 0000940087	Ct 50367 CPSS Maintenance	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0011560 - amended on 4/23/2025 to change supplier OCAWVR0009097 - approved on 1/29/2024	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	$2,400,000.00	Daifuku Services America Corporation	0000057363	6/19/2025
23	1000035825 / No PO	Ct 50419 Support and maintenance for proprietary ALCMS	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0011660	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	$600,000	Global Access Supply Inc	0000019492	Not executed
24	0000939516	GlobalCom Manufacturer for IES/Atlas IED Services for Paging Controller	REQ 0000326666	OCAWVR0011674	21.5(b): No Substitute for Project/Service and Only One Source (Bid Required)	$47,375.32	Actnet Advanced Technology Corp	0000026254	6/17/2025
25	No PO	Aircraft Rescue Fire Fighting (ARFF) Apparatus	REQ 0000328587	OCAWVR0011679	21.16(b): Reciprocal Agreements with Other Public and Non Profit Agencies	$6,800,000	Pierce Manufacturing Inc	0000013148	Not executed
26	1000035794 / No PO	Ct 50371 Call detail reporting tool for cellular phones at SFO	Chapter 21	OCAWVR0011683	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	$100,000	S A I	0000011822	Not executed
				FY24-25 Total:		**$153,371,008.58**			

Item 16

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)
Subject:	1 Approved Requests to Waive 12B Requirements
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 9:49:08 AM
Attachments:	CMD12B0004504.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1(d)(1),from Department of Public Health (DPH), submitting 1 approved Chapter 12B Waiver Request Forms.

Requester: Maggie Wu
Department: DPH
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
Supplier ID: 0000003079
Requested total cost: $379,688.59
Short Description: Sterilizer Purchase & preventive maint. Service in the lab at ZSFG

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.*

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2025-08-28 09:44:07 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004504	Request Status:	Awaiting CMD Director Approval
Requested for:	Maggie Wu	State:	Work in Progress
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michelle Ruggels	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Standard
Opened:	2025-08-11 11:19:48	Requesting Department:	DPH
		Requester Phone:	(628) 271-6175
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Maggie Wu
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Sterilizer Purchase & preventive maint. Service in the lab at ZSFG

Supplier ID:	0000003079	Requested Amount:	$379,688.59
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:	$379,688.59

Document Type:	Contract	Enter Contract ID:	1000036422
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:	2025-09-01
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2027-11-30

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:	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). Steris Corporation
(b). DPH lab will relocate to ZSFG. They would like to purchase the new sterilizers with an extended one-year preventive maintenance service. The supplier/manufacturer is the sole source for the equipment's preventive maintenance service and proprietary replacement parts for the sterilizers.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:
We have made efforts and will continue to do so
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:	New sterilizers with an extended one-year preventive maintenance service. The supplier/manufacturer is the sole source for the equipment's preventive maintenance service and proprietary replacement parts for the sterilizers.		

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:

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:

Vendor has been advised of steps required for compliance and requested to contact CMD for further assistance with the 12B process.

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 = CMD12B0004504
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michelle Ruggels	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004504	2025-08-21 17:28:50		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 982fd3e13b172a107b464b9aa4e45a43
Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-08-25 13:38:26	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004504	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-08-25 13:38:24			false
2025-08-21 17:28:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004504	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-21 17:28:50	2025-08-21 17:28:50	0 Seconds	true
2025-08-11 11:29:20	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004504	Draft	2025-08-11 11:29:16	2025-08-21 17:28:50	10 Days 5 Hours 59 Minutes	true

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-08-25 10:18:45	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004504	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-25 10:18:41	2025-08-25 13:38:24	3 Hours 19 Minutes	true
2025-08-21 17:28:55	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004504	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-21 17:28:50	2025-08-25 10:18:41	3 Days 16 Hours 49 Minutes	true
2025-08-21 17:28:55	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004504	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-21 17:28:50	2025-08-25 10:18:41	3 Days 16 Hours 49 Minutes	true
2025-08-11 11:29:20	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004504	Draft	2025-08-11 11:29:16	2025-08-21 17:28:50	10 Days 5 Hours 59 Minutes	true
2025-08-25 10:18:45	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004504	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-25 10:18:41	2025-08-25 13:38:24	3 Hours 19 Minutes	true
2025-08-25 13:38:26	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004504	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-08-25 13:38:24			false
2025-08-21 17:28:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004504	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-21 17:28:50	2025-08-21 17:28:50	0 Seconds	true

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)
Subject:	11 Approved Requests to Waive 12B Requirements
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:24:03 PM
Attachments:	11 Contracts.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1(d)(1),from various departments, submitting 11 approved Chapter 12B Waiver Request Forms.

Requester: Lisseth Salazar Lopez
Department: CON
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000057469
Requested total cost: $10,862.50
Short Description: Youth Physical Materials

Requester: Lisseth Salazar Lopez
Department: CON
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000025808
Requested total cost: $1,500.00
Short Description: Annual Subscription 10/20/25-09/30/26

Requester: Selina Ng
Department: DPH
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
Supplier ID: 0000009771
Requested total cost: $1,039,303.57
Short Description: CBORD Group Inc. Food Ordering Solution Software License and Maintenance

Requester: Lisseth Salazar Lopez
Department: CON
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000040790
Requested total cost: $2,000.00
Short Description: Subscription materials – Adult

Requester: Vicky Griffith
Department: PUC
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

Supplier ID: 0000022027
Requested total cost: $1,844.00
Short Description: Bottled water (5 gallon) to provide water at the South Fork Yard that is non-potable from non-operational well.

Requester: Leon Ho
Department: DPH
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
Supplier ID: 0000015571
Requested total cost: $8,762.48
Short Description: To purchase Masimo LNCS Sensors.

Requester: Sherri Li
Department: LIB
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000028248
Requested total cost: $1,210.61
Short Description: Button Sets / CPP

Requester: Leon Ho
Department: DPH
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000014051
Requested total cost: $5,000.00
Short Description: Wheelchair repair and parts

Requester: Sean Melody
Department: POL
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000019830
Requested total cost: $2,000.00
Short Description: Request for 12B waiver due to proprietary equipment needing to be serviced by Fuji Film Corporation

Requester: Elisa Ma
Department: POL
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000028091
Requested total cost: $5,000.00
Short Description: 12B Waiver for Team Fabrication

Requester: Elisa Ma
Department: POL

Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000012236
Requested total cost: $6,000.00
Short Description: 12B Waiver request for Rice Lakes Weighing systems

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.*

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details

Run Date and Time: 2025-08-27 16:10:59 Pacific Daylight Time

Run by: ServiceNow Admin

Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004502	Request Status:	Rejected by CMD Analyst
Requested for:	Lisseth Salazar Lopez	State:	Rejected
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michael Lambert	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
Opened:	2025-08-08 16:36:21	Requesting Department:	CON
		Requester Phone:	
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Lisseth Salazar Lopez
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Subscription materials - Adult

Supplier ID:	0000040790	Requested Amount:	$2,000.00
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:	$2,000.00
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:	0000957519
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-08-08
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:	true
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:

San Francisco Business Times, is a specific source for this local interest periodical/newspaper. They also offer wide selection of these titles by individual sellers that are not offered by national vendors

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

I have emailed the vendor encouraging them to be 12B compliant and attached the 12B Compliance Process to vendor

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:	A recent interpretation of Chapter 12B has determined that subscriptions do not meet the definition of "contract" in Chapter 12B. Compliance is not required.		

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:

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:

These are items that the citizens of San Francisco came to expect us to carry. Not being able to provide these materials to our patrons is a disservice to them.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

These are items that we have previously sourced from SF Business Times. We have tried conducting a search through the web and attending professional conferences.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

It does not conflict. Vendor is still working on 12B certification (please pending status).

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 = CMD12B0004502
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michael Lambert	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004502	2025-08-08 17:05:42		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = c8da417ceb536ed0302bf284dad0cdc3
Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-08-11 08:47:36	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004502	Rejected by CMD Analyst	2025-08-11 08:47:35			false
2025-08-10 07:50:10	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004502	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-10 07:50:05	2025-08-11 08:47:35	1 Day 57 Minutes	true
2025-08-08 17:05:45	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004502	Draft	2025-08-08 17:05:42	2025-08-10 07:50:05	1 Day 14 Hours 44 Minutes	true
2025-08-08 17:05:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004502	Draft	2025-08-08 17:05:26	2025-08-08 17:05:42	16 Seconds	true
2025-08-08 17:05:45	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004502	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-08 17:05:42	2025-08-08 17:05:42	0 Seconds	true
2025-08-08 17:05:45	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004502	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-08 17:05:42	2025-08-08 17:05:42	0 Seconds	true
2025-08-08 17:05:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004502	Draft	2025-08-08 17:05:26	2025-08-08 17:05:42	16 Seconds	true
2025-08-11 08:47:36	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004502	Rejected by CMD Analyst	2025-08-11 08:47:35			false
2025-08-08 17:05:45	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004502	Draft	2025-08-08 17:05:42	2025-08-10 07:50:05	1 Day 14 Hours 44 Minutes	true

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-08-10 07:50:10	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004502	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-10 07:50:05	2025-08-11 08:47:35	1 Day 57 Minutes	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details

Run Date and Time: 2025-08-27 16:13:39 Pacific Daylight Time

Run by: ServiceNow Admin

Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004510	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Lisseth Salazar Lopez	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michael Lambert	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
Opened:	2025-08-14 17:53:56	Requesting Department:	CON
		Requester Phone:	
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Lisseth Salazar Lopez
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Annual Subscription 10/20/25-09/30/26

Supplier ID:	0000025808	Requested Amount:	$1,500.00
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:	$1,500.00
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:	0000959435
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-08-14
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:	true
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:

Alldata an online source for automotive original equipment manufacturer (OEM) information. ALLDATA provides vehicle manufacturers' diagnostic and repair information. This is a Main Library access only database

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

I have email the vendor encouraging them to be 12B compliant and attached the 12B Compliance Process to vendor

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)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	An online source for automotive original equipment manufacturer (OEM) information. This is a Main Library access only database for vehicle manufacturers' diagnostic and repair information.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Regina Chan	CMD Director Decision:	Reviewed and Approved

Reason for Determination:

Approved per 12B.5-1(d)(1)

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:

The citizens of San Francisco came to expect us to carry this database. Not being able to provide these materials to our patrons is a disservice to them.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

These are hard-to-find and specialized items. We have tried conducting a search through the web and attending professional conferences.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

It does not conflict. Vendor is still working on 12B certification (please pending status)

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 = CMD12B0004510
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michael Lambert	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004510	2025-08-14 18:22:57		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 4f16187e2bdbee106469ff10de91bf2b
Sort Order: None

12 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-08-15 15:12:40	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004510	Completed	2025-08-15 15:12:38			false
2025-08-14 18:10:06	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004510	Draft	2025-08-14 18:10:03	2025-08-14 18:22:57	12 Minutes	true
2025-08-14 18:23:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004510	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-14 18:22:57	2025-08-14 19:11:19	48 Minutes	true
2025-08-14 19:11:20	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004510	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-14 19:11:19	2025-08-15 15:06:18	19 Hours 54 Minutes	true
2025-08-15 15:06:20	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004510	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-08-15 15:06:18	2025-08-15 15:12:38	6 Minutes	true
2025-08-14 18:23:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004510	Draft	2025-08-14 18:22:57	2025-08-14 18:22:57	0 Seconds	true
2025-08-14 18:23:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004510	Draft	2025-08-14 18:22:57	2025-08-14 18:22:57	0 Seconds	true
2025-08-15 15:12:40	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004510	Completed	2025-08-15 15:12:38			false
2025-08-15 15:06:20	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004510	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-08-15 15:06:18	2025-08-15 15:12:38	6 Minutes	true

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-08-14 18:23:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004510	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-14 18:22:57	2025-08-14 19:11:19	48 Minutes	true
2025-08-14 18:10:06	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004510	Draft	2025-08-14 18:10:03	2025-08-14 18:22:57	12 Minutes	true
2025-08-14 19:11:20	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004510	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-14 19:11:19	2025-08-15 15:06:18	19 Hours 54 Minutes	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2025-08-27 16:14:21 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004511	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Lisseth Salazar Lopez	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michael Lambert	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
Opened:	2025-08-15 09:07:17	Requesting Department:	CON
		Requester Phone:	
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Lisseth Salazar Lopez
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Youth Physical Materials

Supplier ID:	0000057469	Requested Amount:	$10,862.50
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:	$10,862.50
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:	0000959569
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-08-15
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:

Hot Tropiks is a specialized source for hard-to-find books in Filipino for children and teens. They offer a wide selection of books in Filipino not offered by national vendors; they are often the only source for a book.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

I have emailed the vendor encouraging them to be 12B compliant and attached the 12B Compliance Process instructions.

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)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	Specialized source for hard-to-find books in Filipino for children and teens. They offer a wide selection of books in Filipino not offered by national vendors.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Regina Chan	CMD Director Decision:	Reviewed and Approved

Reason for Determination:

Approved per 12B.5-1(d)(1)

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:

These are items that the citizens of San Francisco came to expect us to carry. Not being able to provide these materials to our patrons is a disservice to them.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

These are hard-to-find items. We have tried conducting a search through the web and attending professional conferences

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

It does not conflict. Vendor is still working on 12B certification (please pending status).

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 = CMD12B0004511
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michael Lambert	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004511	2025-08-15 09:31:35		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 8227abf22bd362506469ff10de91bf96
Sort Order: None

12 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-08-15 09:23:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004511	Draft	2025-08-15 09:23:49	2025-08-15 09:31:35	7 Minutes	true
2025-08-15 09:31:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004511	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-15 09:31:35	2025-08-15 09:31:35	0 Seconds	true
2025-08-18 08:06:11	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004511	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-18 08:06:05	2025-08-18 11:25:13	3 Hours 19 Minutes	true
2025-08-21 15:39:20	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004511	Completed	2025-08-21 15:39:19			false
2025-08-15 09:31:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004511	Draft	2025-08-15 09:31:35	2025-08-18 08:06:05	2 Days 22 Hours 34 Minutes	true
2025-08-18 11:25:15	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004511	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-08-18 11:25:13	2025-08-21 15:39:19	3 Days 4 Hours 14 Minutes	true
2025-08-15 09:31:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004511	Draft	2025-08-15 09:31:35	2025-08-18 08:06:05	2 Days 22 Hours 34 Minutes	true
2025-08-18 11:25:15	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004511	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-08-18 11:25:13	2025-08-21 15:39:19	3 Days 4 Hours 14 Minutes	true
2025-08-18 08:06:11	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004511	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-18 08:06:05	2025-08-18 11:25:13	3 Hours 19 Minutes	true

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-08-15 09:31:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004511	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-15 09:31:35	2025-08-15 09:31:35	0 Seconds	true
2025-08-21 15:39:20	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004511	Completed	2025-08-21 15:39:19			false
2025-08-15 09:23:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004511	Draft	2025-08-15 09:23:49	2025-08-15 09:31:35	7 Minutes	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2025-08-27 16:09:07 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004486	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Leon Ho	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michelle Ruggels	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Standard
Opened:	2025-08-01 10:29:38	Requesting Department:	DPH
		Requester Phone:	(628) 754-2326
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Leon Ho
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

To purchase Masimo LNCS Sensors.

Supplier ID:	0000015571	Requested Amount:	$8,762.48
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:	$8,762.48
Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000942307
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21A GPO (DPH Only)	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-08-01
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:	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) Masimo Americas Inc (b) To purchase Masimo LNCS sensors. (c) This purchase is through group purchasing 21A via vizient for DPH thereby Masimo Americas Inc is a preselected vendor.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

Vendor 12B status is inactive. While the vendor is attempting to be compliant or determined to be found unable to comply, we are seeking a waiver in the interim so Laguna Honda Hospital could purchase Masimo LNCS sensors.

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:	Purchase is through group purchasing 21A via vizient for DPH thereby Masimo Americas Inc is a preselected vendor.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Regina Chan	CMD Director Decision:	Reviewed and Approved

Reason for Determination:

Approved per 12B.5-1(d)(2)

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:

Vendor 12B status is inactive.

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 = CMD12B0004486
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michelle Ruggels	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	2025-08-05 13:53:03		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = bfb3f39e3b4bea10cf49eef764e45aa3
Sort Order: None

18 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-08-05 13:44:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Rejected by Dept.Head	2025-08-05 13:44:27	2025-08-05 13:53:04	8 Minutes	true
2025-08-05 13:55:10	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-05 13:55:05	2025-08-05 14:21:05	26 Minutes	true
2025-08-01 10:39:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Draft	2025-08-01 10:38:57	2025-08-05 13:44:27	4 Days 3 Hours 5 Minutes	true

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-08-05 13:53:05	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-05 13:53:04	2025-08-05 13:53:04	0 Seconds	true
2025-08-05 14:21:10	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-08-05 14:21:05	2025-08-12 09:16:56	6 Days 18 Hours 55 Minutes	true
2025-08-05 13:53:05	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Rejected by Dept.Head	2025-08-05 13:53:04	2025-08-05 13:55:05	2 Minutes	true
2025-08-01 10:39:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-01 10:38:57	2025-08-01 10:38:57	0 Seconds	true
2025-08-01 10:29:40	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Draft	2025-08-01 10:29:38	2025-08-01 10:38:57	9 Minutes	true
2025-08-12 09:17:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Completed	2025-08-12 09:16:56			false
2025-08-05 13:53:05	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Rejected by Dept.Head	2025-08-05 13:53:04	2025-08-05 13:55:05	2 Minutes	true
2025-08-12 09:17:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Completed	2025-08-12 09:16:56			false
2025-08-05 14:21:10	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-08-05 14:21:05	2025-08-12 09:16:56	6 Days 18 Hours 55 Minutes	true
2025-08-01 10:39:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-01 10:38:57	2025-08-01 10:38:57	0 Seconds	true
2025-08-01 10:39:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Draft	2025-08-01 10:38:57	2025-08-05 13:44:27	4 Days 3 Hours 5 Minutes	true
2025-08-01 10:29:40	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Draft	2025-08-01 10:29:38	2025-08-01 10:38:57	9 Minutes	true
2025-08-05 13:44:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Rejected by Dept.Head	2025-08-05 13:44:27	2025-08-05 13:53:04	8 Minutes	true
2025-08-05 13:55:10	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-05 13:55:05	2025-08-05 14:21:05	26 Minutes	true
2025-08-05 13:53:05	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004486	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-05 13:53:04	2025-08-05 13:53:04	0 Seconds	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details

Run Date and Time: 2025-08-27 16:12:49 Pacific Daylight Time

Run by: ServiceNow Admin

Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004506	Request Status:	Rejected by CMD Analyst
Requested for:	Selina Ng	State:	Rejected
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michelle Ruggels	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Standard
Opened:	2025-08-13 09:37:52	Requesting Department:	DPH
		Requester Phone:	
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Selina Ng
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

CBORD Group Inc. Food Ordering Solution Software License and Maintenance

Supplier ID:	0000009771	Requested Amount:	$0.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	Modification – Prior Waiver Approved in ServiceNow	Increase Amount:	$24,720.45
		Previously Approved Amount:	$1,014,583.12
		Total Requested Amount:	$1,039,303.57
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:	CMD12B0004285		
Document Type:	Contract	Enter Contract ID:	1000035440
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:	2030-06-30

Advertising:	false
Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :	false
Equipment and Vehicle Lease:	false
On Premise Software and Support:	true
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) The CBORD Group, Inc
(b) The CBORD Group, Inc. food management system is a comprehensive suite of programs used by institutional food service departments of their day to day operations. The software is currently installed at both Laguna Honda Hospital (LHH) and Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospitals (ZSFG). The services are to maintain the current license and optional modules to streamline and automate the FoodService Suite for food service units at DPH. Additionally, contunuation of maintenance services are needed to avoid disruption to the system.
(c) DPH to purchase software licenses and maintenance services for the CBORD food management system which includes 5 years of service. The purchase of the license and maintenance services will be paid from City funds (general funds).

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

Supplier has had previous 12B waivers approved for the same existing licenses and maintenace services. The vendor's previous contracts were also under GPO purchasing authority. Below is the approved 12B waiver, approved 06/19/20

Authorized Transaction #: 1000018068, Software License-CBORD Food Management, DPH. F201-10032. END: 06/30/2025
Authorized Transaction #: 1000035440, Software License and Maintenance for Food Managment, DPH. START 07/01/2025 END 06/30/2030

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:	Software licensing and support is exempt according to Admin Code 21.30. Agreements For Software Licensing, Support, Escrow, Finance, Equipment Maintenance, and Content Data Subscriptions effective 6/02/2025.		

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:

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:

12B waiver was approved for the vendor in previous years as a result of GPO authority.

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:

This contract is not subject to Board Approval.

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 = CMD12B0004506
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michelle Ruggels	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004506	2025-08-13 10:44:33		

Related List Title: Metric List

Table name: metric_instance

Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 36fadd162b5fea106469ff10de91bf01

Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-08-13 09:46:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004506	Draft	2025-08-13 09:46:23	2025-08-13 10:44:33	58 Minutes	true
2025-08-21 13:20:05	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004506	Rejected by CMD Analyst	2025-08-21 13:20:04			false
2025-08-13 11:20:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004506	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-13 11:20:31	2025-08-21 13:20:04	8 Days 1 Hour 59 Minutes	true
2025-08-13 10:44:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004506	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-13 10:44:33	2025-08-13 11:20:31	35 Minutes	true
2025-08-13 10:44:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004506	Draft	2025-08-13 10:44:33	2025-08-13 10:44:33	0 Seconds	true
2025-08-13 10:44:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004506	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-13 10:44:33	2025-08-13 11:20:31	35 Minutes	true
2025-08-13 09:46:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004506	Draft	2025-08-13 09:46:23	2025-08-13 10:44:33	58 Minutes	true
2025-08-21 13:20:05	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004506	Rejected by CMD Analyst	2025-08-21 13:20:04			false
2025-08-13 10:44:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004506	Draft	2025-08-13 10:44:33	2025-08-13 10:44:33	0 Seconds	true
2025-08-13 11:20:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004506	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-13 11:20:31	2025-08-21 13:20:04	8 Days 1 Hour 59 Minutes	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details

Run Date and Time: 2025-08-27 16:07:10 Pacific Daylight Time

Run by: ServiceNow Admin

Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004469	Request Status:	Rejected by CMD Analyst
Requested for:	Leon Ho	State:	Rejected
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michelle Ruggels	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
Opened:	2025-07-29 09:28:47	Requesting Department:	DPH
		Requester Phone:	(628) 754-2326
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Leon Ho
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Wheelchair repair and parts

Supplier ID:	0000014051	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:	0000951715
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-07-29
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:	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). NuMotion (b). Wheelchair repairs and cushions; assorted parts (c) NuMotion is not yet compliant and Laguna Honda has need of service and parts for wheelchairs exclusive to NuMotion.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

DPH has reached out to vendor to comply. In the interim, we are seeking a waiver for exclusive support, repair, and parts for patient wheelchairs.

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:	Supplier is compliant.		

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:

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:

Laguna Honda has existing wheelchairs that need support and parts, and where they are exclusive to NuMotion. in the interim, DPH and Laguna Honda are requesting a waiver.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

The support and parts are exclusive to NuMotion.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

DPH has reached out to supplier to comply. In the interim, we are seeking a waiver to allow Laguna Honda to continue patient care.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

No

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 = CMD12B0004469
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michelle Ruggels	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004469	2025-07-29 09:40:59		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 930944adeb032e50302bf284dad0cd2f
Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-07-29 09:41:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004469	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-29 09:40:59	2025-07-30 05:42:20	20 Hours 1 Minute	true
2025-08-04 14:44:15	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004469	Rejected by CMD Analyst	2025-08-04 14:44:10			false
2025-07-29 09:28:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004469	Draft	2025-07-29 09:28:47	2025-07-29 09:40:59	12 Minutes	true
2025-07-30 05:42:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004469	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-30 05:42:20	2025-08-04 14:44:10	5 Days 9 Hours 1 Minute	true
2025-07-29 09:41:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004469	Draft	2025-07-29 09:40:59	2025-07-29 09:40:59	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-29 09:28:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004469	Draft	2025-07-29 09:28:47	2025-07-29 09:40:59	12 Minutes	true
2025-07-29 09:41:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004469	Draft	2025-07-29 09:40:59	2025-07-29 09:40:59	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-29 09:41:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004469	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-29 09:40:59	2025-07-30 05:42:20	20 Hours 1 Minute	true
2025-07-30 05:42:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004469	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-30 05:42:20	2025-08-04 14:44:10	5 Days 9 Hours 1 Minute	true
2025-08-04 14:44:15	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004469	Rejected by CMD Analyst	2025-08-04 14:44:10			false

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details

Run Date and Time: 2025-08-27 16:08:22 Pacific Daylight Time

Run by: ServiceNow Admin

Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004476	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Sherri Li	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michael Lambert	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
Opened:	2025-07-29 16:53:24	Requesting Department:	LIB
		Requester Phone:	+14155574250
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Sherri Li
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Button Sets / CPP

Supplier ID:	0000028248	Requested Amount:	$1,210.61
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:	$1,210.61

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:	0000953934
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-07-29
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:

Dr. Don's Buttons, purchasing button making and magnet making supplies. Items are to support youth services librarians who offer public programs for youth and their families. The library has previously purchased button makers and supplies by Dr. Don's Buttons. The supplies complement the button maker and are needed to continue with this program offering.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

We have requested they comply.

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)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	Button making and magnet making supplies. Items are to support youth services librarians who offer public programs for youth and their families. The supplies complement the button maker and are needed to continue with this program offering.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Regina Chan	CMD Director Decision:	Reviewed and Approved

Reason for Determination:

Approved per 12B.5-1(d)(1)

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:

Dr. Don's Buttons. Without this approval, Community Partnerships and Programs will have to share existing resources at the library, limiting the ability to share library collateral at both on and offsite events and among library locations.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

Dr. Don's Buttons provides supplies that are needed to continue with youth and family button-making and magnet making programming. Their supplies and button makers are not comparable to other organizations.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

Dr. Don's Buttons allows youth services librarians to offer whole family programming, with an emphasis on intergenerational participation.

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 = CMD12B0004476
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michael Lambert	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004476	2025-07-29 17:11:33		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 5cde65a93b4fa210cf49eef764e45a9a
Sort Order: None

12 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-08-04 12:15:20	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004476	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-04 12:15:19	2025-08-04 14:57:59	2 Hours 42 Minutes	true
2025-07-29 17:11:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004476	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-29 17:11:33	2025-07-29 17:11:33	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-29 17:11:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004476	Draft	2025-07-29 17:11:29	2025-07-29 17:11:33	4 Seconds	true
2025-08-04 14:58:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004476	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-08-04 14:57:59	2025-08-05 13:20:09	22 Hours 22 Minutes	true
2025-08-05 13:20:10	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004476	Completed	2025-08-05 13:20:09			false
2025-07-29 17:11:36	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004476	Draft	2025-07-29 17:11:33	2025-08-04 12:15:19	5 Days 19 Hours 3 Minutes	true
2025-08-05 13:20:10	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004476	Completed	2025-08-05 13:20:09			false

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-08-04 14:58:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004476	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-08-04 14:57:59	2025-08-05 13:20:09	22 Hours 22 Minutes	true
2025-07-29 17:11:36	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004476	Draft	2025-07-29 17:11:33	2025-08-04 12:15:19	5 Days 19 Hours 3 Minutes	true
2025-08-04 12:15:20	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004476	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-04 12:15:19	2025-08-04 14:57:59	2 Hours 42 Minutes	true
2025-07-29 17:11:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004476	Draft	2025-07-29 17:11:29	2025-07-29 17:11:33	4 Seconds	true
2025-07-29 17:11:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004476	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-29 17:11:33	2025-07-29 17:11:33	0 Seconds	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2025-08-01 15:46:26 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004463	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Sean Melody	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Kimmie Wu	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Standard
Opened:	2025-07-28 10:09:01	Requesting Department:	POL
		Requester Phone:	(415) 678-3566
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Sean Melody
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Request for 12B waiver due to proprietary equipment needing to be serviced by Fuji Film Corporation

Supplier ID:	0000019830	Requested Amount:	$2,000.00
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:	$2,000.00
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:	0000952353
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-07-31
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:	true
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:

Waiver is for the Fuji Film Corporation. The purpose of this contract is for emergency maintence and supplies for our Fuji Film DL650 printer. The printer was purchased for $40,000 three years ago and is out of maintance contract. The maintance contract for $9,000 for one year was not fiscally responsible for such a new printer that has not required any maintance over the last three years. This contract is for any emergency maintance that could arise to the total of $2,000 for the fiscal year 2025-2026. Emercency maintance and supplies can only be provided by the FujiFilm corporation. Due to their proprietary equipment and knowledge.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

Yes many attempts to have Fuji Film be 12B Compliant have been made. They have promised that they agree with the critera and are currently in the process of filling out the proper paperwork.

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)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	Emergency maintence and supplies for our Fuji Film DL650 printer for the fiscal year 2025-2026. Emercency maintance and supplies can only be provided by the FujiFilm corporation. Due to their proprietary equipment and knowledge.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Regina Chan	CMD Director Decision:	Reviewed and Approved

Reason for Determination:

Approved per 12B.5-1(d)(1)

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:

The contract is esential to the city because it will allow the printer in the SFPD Photo Lab to be repaired. The printer is used mainly for crime scene investigations, printing posters for Media events, posters for district stations and court presentations. Without this contract the printer will become inoperable. When the printer was purchased, Ricoh was the printer supplier for the city and did not offer the format of printer necessary for our work.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

Requesting the waiver until FujiFilm can become 12B Compliant which they have said that they are working on.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

Steps that were taken include reaching out to other printer repair companies and suppliers both local and national, none of who offer the proprietary equipment and supplies needed to fix the printer that we already have.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

It does not defeat the puproose if the Fuji Film Corporation believes in the critera set forth, just are having a hard time submitting the proper paperwork.

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 = CMD12B0004463

Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Kimmie Wu	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004463	2025-07-28 16:11:39		2025-07-28 16:21:01 - Kimmie Wu (Comments) reply from: Kimmie.Wu@sfgov.org Ref:TIS6024324_Ye0lNzB2pyXyH0HDo9xZ 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 = 72a84f8d3b4b2e50cf49eef764e45a84

Sort Order: None

12 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-07-28 16:21:05	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004463	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-28 16:21:02	2025-07-30 10:55:35	1 Day 18 Hours 34 Minutes	true
2025-07-28 16:11:40	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004463	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-28 16:11:39	2025-07-28 16:11:39	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-28 10:50:55	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004463	Draft	2025-07-28 10:50:53	2025-07-28 16:11:39	5 Hours 20 Minutes	true
2025-07-30 10:55:40	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004463	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-07-30 10:55:35	2025-07-31 17:05:09	1 Day 6 Hours 9 Minutes	true
2025-07-31 17:05:10	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004463	Completed	2025-07-31 17:05:09			false
2025-07-28 16:11:40	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004463	Draft	2025-07-28 16:11:39	2025-07-28 16:21:02	9 Minutes	true
2025-07-28 16:21:05	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004463	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-28 16:21:02	2025-07-30 10:55:35	1 Day 18 Hours 34 Minutes	true
2025-07-28 16:11:40	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004463	Draft	2025-07-28 16:11:39	2025-07-28 16:21:02	9 Minutes	true
2025-07-28 10:50:55	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004463	Draft	2025-07-28 10:50:53	2025-07-28 16:11:39	5 Hours 20 Minutes	true
2025-07-31 17:05:10	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004463	Completed	2025-07-31 17:05:09			false
2025-07-28 16:11:40	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004463	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-28 16:11:39	2025-07-28 16:11:39	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-30 10:55:40	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004463	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-07-30 10:55:35	2025-07-31 17:05:09	1 Day 6 Hours 9 Minutes	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details

Run Date and Time: 2025-08-27 16:00:26 Pacific Daylight Time

Run by: ServiceNow Admin

Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004403	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Elisa Ma	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Kimmie Wu	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Standard
Opened:	2025-06-26 10:43:54	Requesting Department:	POL
		Requester Phone:	(415) 671-3263
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Elisa Ma
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

12B Waiver request for Rice Lakes Weighing systems

Supplier ID:	0000012236	Requested Amount:	$6,000.00
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:	$6,000.00

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:	0000942077
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	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:	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:

Rice Lake Weighing Systems / Heusser Neweigh is the only local provider for metrology and calibration services including calibration and sale of instruments for measuring mass, temperature, force, dimensions, physical measurements, pressure and volume. They are the only company that can provide pick up, transport, and calibration for the Laboratory's critical measuring equipment that must undergo annual calibration in order to comply with our accreditation requirements. This company also provides certificates of accreditation for their products as required for our quality assurance program. The crime lab would utilize this vendor for calibration of and purchase of equipment in the Forensic Biology, Firearms and Forensic Alcohol Units.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

See attachment with email to supplier regarding compliance with chapter 12B equal benefits. However, we've not received a response

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)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	The only local provider for metrology and calibration services including calibration and sale of instruments for measuring mass, temperature, force, dimensions, physical measurements, pressure and volume. The only company that can provide pick up, transport, and calibration for the Laboratory's critical measuring equipment that must undergo annual calibration in order to comply with our accreditation requirements. Crime lab utilizes this vendor for calibration of and purchase of equipment in the Forensic Biology, Firearms and Forensic Alcohol Units.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Regina Chan	CMD Director Decision:	Reviewed and Approved

Reason for Determination:

Approved per 12B.5-1(d)(1)

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:

Rice Lake Weighing Systems / Heusser Neweigh is the only local provider for metrology and calibration services including calibration and sale of instruments for measuring mass, temperature, force, dimensions, physical measurements, pressure and volume. They are the only company that can provide pick up, transport, and calibration for the Laboratory's critical measuring equipment that must undergo annual calibration in order to comply with our accreditation requirements. This company also provides certificates of accreditation for their products as required for our quality assurance program. The crime lab would utilize this vendor for calibration of and purchase of equipment in the Forensic Biology, Firearms and Forensic Alcohol Units.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

Rice Lake Weighing Systems / Heusser Neweigh is the only local provider for metrology and calibration services including calibration and sale of instruments for measuring mass, temperature, force, dimensions, physical measurements, pressure and volume. They are the only company that can provide pick up, transport, and calibration for the Laboratory's critical measuring equipment that must undergo annual calibration in order to comply with our accreditation requirements. This company also provides certificates of accreditation for their products as required for our quality assurance program. The crime lab would utilize this vendor for calibration of and purchase of equipment in the Forensic Biology, Firearms and Forensic Alcohol Units.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

We've attempted to have the vendor become 12B compliant with emails and follow up requests which were met with no reply.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

There are no other vendors available who meet the compliance and can provide the needed goods/services and we've taken reasonable steps to find a compliant vendor, but this one is essential or unique.

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 = CMD12B0004403
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Kimmie Wu	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004403	2025-07-28 13:49:17		2025-07-28 15:12:37 - Kimmie Wu (Comments) reply from: Kimmie.Wu@sfgov.org Ref:TIS6023874_P1ZpR4KJTJexmf7XqRP7 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 = 82cd1efaeb566e10302bf284dad0cdbd

Sort Order: None

12 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-07-28 13:49:20	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004403	Draft	2025-07-28 13:49:17	2025-07-28 13:49:17	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-31 17:05:31	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004403	Completed	2025-07-31 17:05:28			false
2025-07-28 15:12:40	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004403	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-28 15:12:38	2025-07-30 10:27:30	1 Day 19 Hours 14 Minutes	true
2025-07-28 13:49:20	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004403	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-28 13:49:17	2025-07-28 15:12:38	1 Hour 23 Minutes	true
2025-06-26 10:48:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004403	Draft	2025-06-26 10:48:33	2025-07-28 13:49:17	32 Days 3 Hours	true
2025-07-30 10:27:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004403	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-07-30 10:27:30	2025-07-31 17:05:28	1 Day 6 Hours 37 Minutes	true
2025-06-26 10:48:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004403	Draft	2025-06-26 10:48:33	2025-07-28 13:49:17	32 Days 3 Hours	true
2025-07-30 10:27:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004403	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-07-30 10:27:30	2025-07-31 17:05:28	1 Day 6 Hours 37 Minutes	true
2025-07-31 17:05:31	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004403	Completed	2025-07-31 17:05:28			false
2025-07-28 13:49:20	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004403	Draft	2025-07-28 13:49:17	2025-07-28 13:49:17	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-28 15:12:40	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004403	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-28 15:12:38	2025-07-30 10:27:30	1 Day 19 Hours 14 Minutes	true
2025-07-28 13:49:20	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004403	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-28 13:49:17	2025-07-28 15:12:38	1 Hour 23 Minutes	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details

Run Date and Time: 2025-08-27 16:03:28 Pacific Daylight Time

Run by: ServiceNow Admin

Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004404	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Elisa Ma	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Kimmie Wu	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Standard
Opened:	2025-06-26 11:40:53	Requesting Department:	POL
		Requester Phone:	(415) 671-3263
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Elisa Ma
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

12B Waiver for Team Fabrication

Supplier ID:	0000028091	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:	0000942084
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	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:	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:

This waiver is requested for the purchase of items and service for our existing Bullet Recovery Tank located in the Firearms shooting room. The Firearms identification units' bullet recovery tank made by Team Fabrication receives yearly and as needed service and updates. There are not other vendors or outfits that are authorized or qualified to perform the necessary repairs. This device is a critical piece of equipment essential to the continued operation of the Firearms Unit.

Team Fabrication is the only vendor on the market with a recovery device that meets our need to recover bullets fired from the medium/large caliber rifles up to 35 caliber and foot pound energies up to 6000. The Team Fabrication water tank meets our specifications for; safely accommodating firearms with muzzle energies of greater than 4000 fpe, reducing environmental and occupational exposure to airborne lead and fits into the limited space of the range.

Due to the fact that Team Fabrication is the manufacturer of the bullet recovery tank, and the sole source vendor with specialty training and tools; Team Fabrication is a sole source vendor.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

See attachment with email to supplier regarding compliance with chapter 12B equal benefits. However, we've not received a response

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)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	Purchase items and service for our existing Bullet Recovery Tank located in the Firearms shooting room. Firearms identification units' bullet recovery tank made by Team Fabrication receives yearly and as needed service and updates. This device is a critical piece of equipment essential to the continued operation of the Firearms Unit. Team Fabrication is the manufacturer of the bullet recovery tank, and the sole source vendor with specialty training and tools		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Regina Chan	CMD Director Decision:	Reviewed and Approved

Reason for Determination:

Approved per 12B.5-1(d)(1)

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:

This waiver is requested for the purchase of items and service for our existing Bullet Recovery Tank located in the Firearms shooting room. The Firearms identification units' bullet recovery tank made by Team Fabrication receives yearly and as needed service and updates. There are not other vendors or outfits that are authorized or qualified to perform the necessary repairs. This device is a critical piece of equipment essential to the continued operation of the Firearms Unit.

Team Fabrication is the only vendor on the market with a recovery device that meets our need to recover bullets fired from the medium/large caliber rifles up to 35 caliber and foot pound energies up to 6000. The Team Fabrication water tank meets our specifications for; safely accommodating firearms with muzzle energies of greater than 4000 fpe, reducing environmental and occupational exposure to airborne lead and fits into the limited space of the range.

Due to the fact that Team Fabrication is the manufacturer of the bullet recovery tank, and the sole source vendor with specialty training and tools; Team Fabrication is a sole source vendor.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

This waiver is requested for the purchase of items and service for our existing Bullet Recovery Tank located in the Firearms shooting room. The Firearms identification units' bullet recovery tank made by Team Fabrication receives yearly and as needed service and updates. There are not other vendors or outfits that are authorized or qualified to perform the necessary repairs. This device is a critical piece of equipment essential to the continued operation of the Firearms Unit.

Team Fabrication is the only vendor on the market with a recovery device that meets our need to recover bullets fired from the medium/large caliber rifles up to 35 caliber and foot pound energies up to 6000. The Team Fabrication water tank meets our specifications for; safely accommodating firearms with muzzle energies of greater than 4000 fpe, reducing environmental and occupational exposure to airborne lead and fits into the limited space of the range.

Due to the fact that Team Fabrication is the manufacturer of the bullet recovery tank, and the sole source vendor with specialty training and tools; Team Fabrication is a sole source vendor.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

We've attmpeted to have the vendor become 12B compliant with emails and follow ups which were met with no reply.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

There are no other vendors available who meet the compliance and can provide the needed goods/services and we've taken reasonable steps to find a compliant vendor, but this one is essential to our needs within the lab.

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 = CMD12B0004404

Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Kimmie Wu	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004404	2025-07-28 13:51:58		2025-07-28 15:12:43 - Kimmie Wu (Comments) reply from: Kimmie.Wu@sfgov.org Ref:TIS6023900_1vSmP16rPd1TQexzyLx2 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 = ecdaae7aebd66e10302bf284dad0cdf2

Sort Order: None

12 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-07-28 13:52:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004404	Draft	2025-07-28 13:51:58	2025-07-28 13:51:58	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-28 15:12:45	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004404	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-28 15:12:43	2025-07-30 10:17:49	1 Day 19 Hours 5 Minutes	true
2025-07-31 17:05:45	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004404	Completed	2025-07-31 17:05:44			false
2025-07-28 13:52:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004404	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-28 13:51:58	2025-07-28 15:12:43	1 Hour 20 Minutes	true
2025-07-30 10:17:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004404	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-07-30 10:17:49	2025-07-31 17:05:44	1 Day 6 Hours 47 Minutes	true
2025-06-26 11:43:15	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004404	Draft	2025-06-26 11:43:12	2025-07-28 13:51:58	32 Days 2 Hours 8 Minutes	true
2025-07-28 15:12:45	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004404	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-28 15:12:43	2025-07-30 10:17:49	1 Day 19 Hours 5 Minutes	true
2025-06-26 11:43:15	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004404	Draft	2025-06-26 11:43:12	2025-07-28 13:51:58	32 Days 2 Hours 8 Minutes	true
2025-07-28 13:52:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004404	Draft	2025-07-28 13:51:58	2025-07-28 13:51:58	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-31 17:05:45	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004404	Completed	2025-07-31 17:05:44			false
2025-07-28 13:52:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004404	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-28 13:51:58	2025-07-28 15:12:43	1 Hour 20 Minutes	true
2025-07-30 10:17:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004404	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-07-30 10:17:49	2025-07-31 17:05:44	1 Day 6 Hours 47 Minutes	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2025-08-27 16:10:01 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004497	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Vicky Griffith	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Steve Ritchie	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Standard
Opened:	2025-08-06 11:36:13	Requesting Department:	PUC
		Requester Phone:	(209) 877-3299
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Vicky Griffith
		Watch list:	Vicky Griffith, Chris McKernon

Short Description:

Bottled water (5 gallon) to provide water at the South Fork Yard that is non-potable from non-operational well.

Supplier ID:	0000022027	Requested Amount:	$1,844.00
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:	$1,844.00
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:	0000956127
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-08-07
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:

Hetch Hetchy Water (HHW) requires the purchase of potable water for the South Fork yard in Tuolumne County. The on-site well is not operational therefore the water is not potable. By OSHA standards, CCSF is required to supply potable water for the work location for crews that are assigned to that specific work location. The contract holder for CCSF will not service the up-country area of Moccasin. To minimize plastic waste, 5-gallon water jugs are recycled and reused in accordance with City and County of San Francisco policies. As a relatively new vendor, HHW's purchasing team is working with them to achieve equal benefits supplier status with the city; this waiver is temporarily in place during that process.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

Information has been provided to the supplier to become an equal benefits compliant supplier.

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)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	Potable water for the South Fork yard in Tuolumne County. CCSF is required to supply potable water for the work location for crews that are assigned to that specific work location. The contract holder for CCSF will not service the up-country area of Moccasin.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Regina Chan	CMD Director Decision:	Reviewed and Approved

Reason for Determination:

Approved per 12B.5-1(d)(1)

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:

Hetch Hetchy Water (HHW) requires the purchase of potable water for the South Fork yard in Tuolumne County. The on-site well is not operational therefore the water is not potable. By OSHA standards, CCSF is required to supply potable water for the work location for crews that are assigned to that specific work location. The contract holder for CCSF will not service the up-country area of Moccasin. The local company used in previous years has been acquired by this new company.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

Hetch Hetchy Water (HHW) requires the purchase of potable water for the South Fork yard in Tuolumne County. The on-site well is not operational therefore the water is not potable. By OSHA standards, CCSF is required to supply potable water for the work location for crews that are assigned to that specific work location. The contract holder for CCSF will not service the up-country area of Moccasin. The local company used in previous years has been acquired by this new company.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

The company utilized for this purchase previously was 12B compliant. The company has been sold to a new company and they are in the process for the 12B compliance. The city's contract holder for this product is unwilling to service the Moccasin area limiting suppliers that are willing to service the Moccasin area. This waiver is temporary until compliance is achieved.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

The company utilized for this purchase previously was 12B compliant. The company has been sold to a new company and they are in the process for the 12B compliance. The city's contract holder for this product is unwilling to service the Moccasin area limiting suppliers that are willing to service the Moccasin area. This waiver is temporary until compliance is achieved.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

Yes

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 = CMD12B0004497
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Steve Ritchie	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004497	2025-08-06 12:03:11		2025-08-09 18:20:20 - Steve Ritchie (Comments) reply from: SRitchie@sfwater.org Approved. Steven Ritchie. Ref:TIS6044549_51xMuioH2ZmNRGgIlece

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 4cf27dc4ebd766d0302bf284dad0cd47
Sort Order: None

12 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-08-11 08:33:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004497	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-08-11 08:33:23	2025-08-12 09:17:18	1 Day 43 Minutes	true
2025-08-06 12:03:15	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004497	Draft	2025-08-06 12:03:11	2025-08-09 18:20:21	3 Days 6 Hours 17 Minutes	true
2025-08-06 12:01:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004497	Draft	2025-08-06 12:01:24	2025-08-06 12:03:11	1 Minute	true
2025-08-09 18:20:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004497	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-09 18:20:21	2025-08-11 08:33:23	1 Day 14 Hours 13 Minutes	true
2025-08-12 09:17:20	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004497	Completed	2025-08-12 09:17:18			false
2025-08-06 12:03:15	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004497	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-06 12:03:11	2025-08-06 12:03:11	0 Seconds	true
2025-08-12 09:17:20	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004497	Completed	2025-08-12 09:17:18			false
2025-08-06 12:01:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004497	Draft	2025-08-06 12:01:24	2025-08-06 12:03:11	1 Minute	true
2025-08-06 12:03:15	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004497	Dept. Head approval	2025-08-06 12:03:11	2025-08-06 12:03:11	0 Seconds	true
2025-08-06 12:03:15	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004497	Draft	2025-08-06 12:03:11	2025-08-09 18:20:21	3 Days 6 Hours 17 Minutes	true
2025-08-11 08:33:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004497	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-08-11 08:33:23	2025-08-12 09:17:18	1 Day 43 Minutes	true
2025-08-09 18:20:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004497	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-08-09 18:20:21	2025-08-11 08:33:23	1 Day 14 Hours 13 Minutes	true

Item 17

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)
Subject:	Chapter 21B waiver notifications - 2 letters
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 10:11:29 AM
Attachments:	21B Waiver Notifications - 2 contracts.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached, from Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), pursuant to Ordinance No. 10-25, submitting two Administrative Code, Chapter 21B, waiver notifications

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:	Schneider, Dylan (HOM)
To:	Bonde, Aly (MYR)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); OCA (ADM); Macaulay, Devin (CON); Yuan, Jane (CON); Modi, Kunal (MYR); Pan, Eufern (MYR); Thongsavat, Adam (MYR); McSpadden, Shireen (HOM); Whitley, Gigi (HOM); Cohen, Emily (HOM); Velasquez, Edilyn (HOM); Gil, Hailey (HOM)
Subject:	21B Waiver Notification - Contract - 3rd Street Youth Center & Clinic
Date:	Friday, August 15, 2025 8:06:50 AM
Attachments:	3rd St - TAY Transitional Housing Just Home - Chapter 21B - DocuSigned.pdf Outlook-DHSH_symbo.png

---

Good morning Aly,

Please find attached written notice for a waiver of Chapter 21B (authorized under Ordinance No. 010-25) for HSH to enter into a new grant agreement with 3rd Street Youth Center & Clinic for the administration of a new transitional housing program serving up to 19 young adults.

The administration of transitional housing for young adults is a project addressing homelessness and part of the Core Initiative of addressing homelessness.

Thank you,
Dylan

Dylan Schneider, MPA (she/her)
Manager of Legislative Affairs
San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
email@sfgov.org | O: 628.652.7742

Learn: sf.gov/hsh | 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 Protected Personal Information (PPI) and/or Protected Health Information (PHI) contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.

Docusign Envelope ID: 57CABF2E-837F-489F-BB52-AF02575EB2E5

Department & Agreement Information (*required)

Department Name*: Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing

Agreement Type*: Grant

Department Contact Name*: Edilyn Velasquez

Department Contact Phone #: 415-297-5436

Department Contact Email*: Edilyn.Velasquez@sfgov.org

For Contracts, Requisitions, and Purchase Orders:

Contract/Req/PO PeopleSoft ID#: 1000035751

Anticipated Contract/PO Amount: $744,786

Anticipated Contract/PO Start Date: 9/1/2025

Anticipated Contract/PO End Date: 6/30/2027

Supplier ID: 0000016602

Supplier Name: Larkin Street Youth Services

Provide details about the anticipated agreement*:

The Transitional Age Youth (TAY) Flexible Housing Subsidy Pool (FHSP) Young Adult Court (YAC) program utilizes local funding to expand the existing FHSP program for youth. Referrals come from YAC, an innovative court diversion initiative, which serves youth ages 18 to 24 who have been adjudicated through the court and are experiencing homelessness. Larkin Street Youth Services has administered this program since 2018, funded through the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP). The existing program has demonstrated success and aligns with HSH's Home by the Bay strategic plan as part of a broader effort to advance equity within San Francisco's homelessness response system.

The FHSP is a scattered-site permanent supportive housing program that places households in private market units with rental subsidies and housing focused case management. FHSP offers greater flexibility than site-based Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) by providing more housing options throughout the city. Additionally, FHSP delivers services within the community which helps foster a more independent living experience for program participants.

In the transition age youth (TAY) FHSP program, participating households receive ongoing rental subsidies, pay 30 percent of the total household income towards rent, sign their own leases to secure tenant rights and receive comprehensive case management support.

Core Initiative Information

This lease or contract is a "Core Initiative Lease" or a "Core Initiative Contract" per Administrative Code Section 21B.2 because it is a "Project Addressing _____":

- ☒ **Homelessness**, defined as "projects designed to prevent homelessness through the provision of housing subsidies or other services, and projects designed to provide shelter, housing, food, and/or social services to people experiencing homelessness."
- ☐ **Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders**, defined as "projects designed to reduce drug-related deaths and support individuals with substance use disorders (SUDs)."
- ☐ **Mental Health Needs**, defined as "projects designed to support people with mental health disorders."
- ☐ **Integrated Health Needs**, defined as "projects designed to serve people who are at risk of experiencing homelessness due to the potential loss of their shelter, housing, or release from an institution."

☐ **Public Safety Hiring**, defined as "projects to support the hiring process for, and/or the recruitment, training, and retention of, police officers, deputy sheriffs, and 911 operators."

Describe why the contract or lease is necessary to support the Core Initiative(s) selected above:
The agreement for TAY FHSP is a project addressing homelessness. This new agreement adds capacity to the homelessness response system by providing permanent housing subsidies and supportive services to TAY households. The TAY FHSP YAC program provides permanent FHSP to participants of the Young Adult Court program which serves youth ages 18 to 24 who have been adjudicated through the court and are experiencing homelessness. The goals of these services are to reduce the length of time participants spend experiencing homelessness, and to support the served population in retaining and stabilizing with their housing. The services provided by this agreement align with San Francisco's Home By the Bay plan by advancing targeted strategies to support TAY in the Young Adult Court system in securing and maintaining stable housing.

Signature

Shireen McSpadden	DocuSigned by: Shireen McSpadden CAD7B781896B449...	8/7/2025 Select date
Department Head or Designee Name	Signature	Date

From:	Schneider, Dylan (HOM)
To:	Bonde, Aly (MYR)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); OCA (ADM); Macaulay, Devin (CON); Yuan, Jane (CON); Modi, Kunal (MYR); Pan, Eufern (MYR); Thongsavat, Adam (MYR); McSpadden, Shireen (HOM); Whitley, Gigi (HOM); Cohen, Emily (HOM); Velasquez, Edilyn (HOM); Gil, Hailey (HOM)
Subject:	21B Waiver Notification - Contract - Larkin Street Youth Services
Date:	Friday, August 15, 2025 8:07:05 AM
Attachments:	Larkin - TAY FHSP YAC - Chapter 21B Justification - FINAL - DocuSigned.pdf Outlook-DHSH_symbo.png

Good morning Aly,

Please find attached written notice for a waiver of Chapter 21B (authorized under Ordinance No. 010-25) for HSH to enter into a new grant agreement with Larkin Street for Youth Services for the administration of 8 additional flexible housing pool subsidy slots for young adults.

The administration of scattered site permanent supportive housing for young adults is a project addressing homelessness and part of the Core Initiative of addressing homelessness.

Thank you,
Dylan

Dylan Schneider, MPA (she/her)
Manager of Legislative Affairs
San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
email@sfgov.org | O: 628.652.7742

Learn: sf.gov/hsh | 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 Protected Personal Information (PPI) and/or Protected Health Information (PHI) contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.

Docusign Envelope ID: DA72E240-0333-4ED8-8629-2FFA4E01F261

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Department & Agreement Information (*required)

Department Name*: Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing

Agreement Type*: Grant

Department Contact Name*: Edilyn Velasquez

Department Contact Phone #*: 415-297-5436

Department Contact Email*: Edilyn.Velasquez@sfgov.org

For Contracts, Requisitions, and Purchase Orders:

Contract/Req/PO PeopleSoft ID#: 1000036316

Anticipated Contract/PO Amount: $3,734,138

Anticipated Contract/PO Start Date: 9/1/2025

Anticipated Contract/PO End Date: 6/30/2028

Supplier ID: 0000043232

Supplier Name: 3rd Street Youth Center & Clinic

Provide details about the anticipated agreement*:

This new agreement with the 3rd Street Youth Center & Clinic (3rd Street) will provide up to 19 participants with transitional housing and housing-focused support services at the TAY Transitional Housing Just Home Program, located at 3900 3rd St. Based in Bayview Hunters Point. 3rd Street has deep community ties and strong outcomes for housing justice-involved youth (ages 18–27) who are high system utilizers. Their client-centered model aligns with Just Home's commitment to engaging people with lived experience. 3rd Street will provide supportive services for up to 36 months, including case management services, re-entry services, transitional housing stability support, housing navigation, professional development, personal development, community development, exit and aftercare planning, and wellness services to justice-involved TAY.

Core Initiative Information

This lease or contract is a "Core Initiative Lease" or a "Core Initiative Contract" per Administrative Code Section 21B.2 because it is a "Project Addressing _____":

- ☒ **Homelessness**, defined as "projects designed to prevent homelessness through the provision of housing subsidies or other services, and projects designed to provide shelter, housing, food, and/or social services to people experiencing homelessness."
- ☐ **Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders**, defined as "projects designed to reduce drug-related deaths and support individuals with substance use disorders (SUDs)."
- ☐ **Mental Health Needs**, defined as "projects designed to support people with mental health disorders."
- ☐ **Integrated Health Needs**, defined as "projects designed to serve people who are at risk of experiencing homelessness due to the potential loss of their shelter, housing, or release from an institution."
- ☐ **Public Safety Hiring**, defined as "projects to support the hiring process for, and/or the recruitment, training, and retention of, police officers, deputy sheriffs, and 911 operators."

Describe why the contract or lease is necessary to support the Core Initiative(s) selected above:
New Agreement/Contract Amendment:

This new TAY Transitional Housing Just Home Program will expand the current TAY Shelter System by providing safe and supportive short-term housing for up to 19 participants. At the same time, services will help participants stabilize their living situations, improve their mental and physical health, develop individualized service plans to support them to set professional and personal goals, and connect them to employment and educational opportunities. The program will enhance participants' sense of community and belonging, decrease recidivism, and increase their independent living skills to support them in transitioning to permanent housing. This program will fill the gap in the Homelessness Response System for justice-involved TAY with a unique barrier to housing.

Signature

Shireen McSpadden	DocuSigned by: Shireen McSpadden CAD7B781896B449...	8/8/2025 Select date
Department Head or Designee Name	Signature	Date

Item 18

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)
Subject:	Chapter 21B waiver notifications - 2 letters
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 10:20:36 AM
Attachments:	Quarterly Reports.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached two letters, from various departments, pursuant to Chapter 21B.3, Ordinance No. 10-25, and Ordinance No. 38-24, submitting Administrative Code, Chapter 21B, quarterly reports for reporting period 04/01/2025 through 06/30/2025.

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:	Schneider, Dylan (HOM)
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Modi, Kunal (MYR); McSpadden, Shireen (HOM); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Thongsavat, Adam (MYR); Darmali, Dexter (MYR); Whitley, Gigi (HOM); Velasquez, Edilyn (HOM); Cohen, Emily (HOM); Robinson, Davares (HOM)
Subject:	HSH Chapter 21B Quarterly Report
Date:	Thursday, July 31, 2025 2:20:59 PM
Attachments:	Ch 21B FY 2024-25_Q3 & Q4 Report_HSH_FINAL.pdf Outlook-DHSH_symbo.png

---

Good afternoon,

Attached please find HSH's quarterly report as required by the Administrative Code Chapter 21B.3 and Ordinance Nos. 010-25 and 038-24.

Please don't hesitate to reach out with any questions or concerns.

Thank you,
Dylan

Dylan Schneider, MPA (she/her)
Manager of Legislative Affairs
San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
email@sfgov.org | O: 628.652.7742

Learn: sf.gov/hsh | 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 Protected Personal Information (PPI) and/or Protected Health Information (PHI) contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.

SAN FRANCISCO
HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

Reporting Period (agreements executed between): 4/1/2025 and 6/30/2025

Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract/PO/Req PeopleSoft ID#**: 1000036179
Supplier Name: Ahsing Solutions		**Supplier ID**: 0000058072
Contract Start Date: 7/1/2025	**Contract End Date**: 12/31/2025	**Funds Encumbered to date**: $498,267

Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:

☒ Homelessness

☒ Mental Health Needs

☒ Integrated Health Needs

☒ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders

☐ Public Safety Hiring

Services provided under the contract during reporting period: This grant will fund ongoing deployment of a specialized and highly trained ambassador program for the Mission neighborhood

1. Program Management: Perform all required program, cost, and project management needs for a successful program, including but not limited to budgetary forecasting, cost and resource analysis, expense reporting, staff schedule projections, and contingency planning for all programmatic requirements.

2. Program Implementation: Hire, train, and deploy no fewer than six (6) ambassadors, with priority from affected communities with lived experience. Provide thorough and comprehensive on-boarding training to staff, including but not limited to de-escalation, overdose reversal, customer service, City Street Response Coordination and City social services (provided by City), and others as requested by City. Address performance and/or personnel issues as required and to a degree deemed acceptable by City. Successful program implementation includes ambassadors implementing the following services:

    a. **Positive Engagements:** Ambassadors shall consistently engage with community members and serve as a community connector by providing resource information and service connections. Ambassadors shall conduct hourly foot patrols in designated corridors to monitor safety, deter drug use, and support vulnerable individuals. Ambassadors will provide friendly greetings and basic wayfinding services to the community.

    b. **Basic Interventions**: Ambassadors shall invite the whole community to participate in creating a safe and inviting space for all by maintaining common spaces clear of debris. Ambassadors shall make a good faith effort to interrupt negative behavior in the Service Area including but not limited to public urination/defecation, littering, drug use, and general noise disturbances.

Department of Benefits and Family Support

Department of Disability and Aging Services

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Trent Rhorer
Executive Director, SFHSA

Kelly Dearman
Executive Director, DAS

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

Ambassador staff shall contact the local authorities for activities that may endanger the staff and public.

c. **De-Escalation Interventions**: Ambassadors will assist with relational and other interventions to help contain mental health episodes, to reverse overdose events, to prevent or interrupt street violence, or to prevent crime so long as it does not endanger Ambassadors.

d. **Cleaning & Sanitation Services**: Ambassadors shall assist with trash pick-up, including needle pickup and disposal, in designated areas and as necessary. Ambassadors shall contact the appropriate City or partner resources for more significant sanitation needs.

e. **Drug Activity Deterrence**: Ambassadors shall regularly engage known drug-use locations using trauma-informed, non-confrontational approaches. Ambassadors will orient the participants in these markets to the needs of the community for a drug-free zone.

f. **Resource Connections**: Ambassadors shall offer immediate aid (i.e. administer Narcan to reverse and overdose and call 911) and connect individuals in crisis to the available housing, medical care, or treatment services available in or around the Service Area.

g. **Safe Passage**: Ambassadors will provide escort and support for vulnerable residents navigating high-risk corridors.

h. **Wellness Checks**: Ambassadors shall conduct proactive wellness checks with unhoused individuals and others who are at risk, building rapport, assessing needs, and referring to support or assistance as necessary.

i. **Communications**: Deployed Ambassadors shall carry two-way radios, provided by Grantee, to ensure rapid communication and safety response.

3. Coordination with City: Participate in regular coordination meetings with the City via daily huddles and weekly management meetings at which operational and deployment plans shall be discussed and approved by City. Participate in stakeholder and City efforts including, but not limited to, the Drug Market Agency Coordination Center (DMACC), street response coordination efforts such as Neighborhood Street Teams, utilizing the 311 and 911 systems, and others to ensure the appropriate response for different situations that may arise.

4. Reporting: Deployed Ambassadors will keep and submit daily incident and service logs to their supervisors at the conclusion of each shift, which shall be available to City upon request. Grantee will provide monthly reports to City within fifteen (15) calendar days of the conclusion of each month. Reports shall include, but not be limited to, deployment data (e.g. number of staff, total staff hours), outcome data for each of the above-listed service objectives, summaries of issues/challenges and how they were resolved, and notable events or engagements. Data shall be compiled for that corresponding month, plus cumulative totals since contract commencement. City may add additional data points for collection at any time during the course of the agreement. All monthly reports

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

must include data for Grantee plus any additional subgrantees associated with the agreement.

5. Ramp-Down Planning: As requested by City and with thirty (30) days' notice, provide a strategic transition plan providing recommendations for City transition away from or reduce the number of Grantee's ambassador resources.

Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Provide details about outcomes resulting from the agreement

1. 100% of ambassadors providing services under this agreement shall have lived experience with homelessness, recovery from substance abuse, and/or justice system involvement.
2. 90% of days under this grant, Grantee will maintain acceptable levels of collaboration with City and community-based partners.
3. 90% of days under this grant, Grantee will report daily staff deployment.
4. 90% of weeks under this grant, Grantee will attend weekly meetings with DEM to allow for program supervision and discuss any required or requested deployment or operational adjustments.
5. 100% of monthly reporting shall be completed on or before the 15th day of each month.
6. 100% of incidents shall be reported to the City the same day the Grantee becomes aware of the matter.

SAN FRANCISCO
HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

Reporting Period (agreements executed between): 4/1/2025 and 6/30/2025

Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract/PO/Req PeopleSoft ID#**: 1000036172
Supplier Name: Tenderloin Community Benefit District		**Supplier ID**: 0000014228
Contract Start Date: 7/1/2025	**Contract End Date**: 12/31/2025	**Funds Encubmered to date**: $500,000

Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:

☒ Homelessness

☒ Mental Health Needs

☒ Integrated Health Needs

☒ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders

☐ Public Safety Hiring

Services provided under the contract during reporting period: This grant will fund ongoing deployment of a specialized and highly trained ambassador program for the Tenderloin neighborhood.

1. Program Management: Perform all required program, cost, and project management needs for a successful program, including but not limited to budgetary forecasting, cost and resource analysis, expense reporting, staff schedule projections, and contingency planning for all programmatic requirements.
2. Coordination with City: Participate in regular coordination meetings with the City via weekly management meetings at which operational and deployment plans shall be discussed and approved by City. Participate in stakeholder and City efforts including, but not limited to, the Drug Market Agency Coordination Center (DMACC), street response coordination efforts such as Neighborhood Street Teams, utilizing the 311 and 911 systems, and others to ensure the appropriate response for different situations that may arise. At least monthly, Grantee shall meet with appropriate representatives of the following departments and operations to either inform them of progress and ongoing issues or coordinate service delivery: DEM, HSA, DPW, RPD, SFPD, SFFD, DPH, HSH.
3. Program Plan: Grantee shall provide a planning report on how the Park Stewardship program will be implemented and a planning report shall be created to include, but is not limited to, the following information:
    a. Hours of operation at each location
    b. Number of stewards at each location
    c. Map of each location showcasing where stewards will be primarily located

Department of Benefits and Family Support

Department of Disability and Aging Services

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Trent Rhorer
Executive Director, SFHSA

Kelly Dearman
Executive Director, DAS

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

d. Data collection template on street conditions and park utilizations
e. A job description for park stewards

4. Park Stewardship: Grantee shall be responsible for implementing a Park Stewardship program that will provide safety and stewardship across the Tenderloin Park Network. This shall ensure three public parks (Boeddeker, Sgt. John Macaulay, and Turk-Hyde Mini Park) are safe, clean, and activated allowing everyone to access to open space and outdoor play. It will provide this by activating public spaces and detouring negative activity through "positive interventions".

5. Cleaning & Sanitation Services: Grantee shall improve the neighborhood's environmental health and the well-being of citizens by working to improve sidewalk conditions. Specifically, Grantee shall provide pan and broom cleaning, pressure washing, chemical steam cleaning, trash removal, cleaning and topping off trashcans, and responding to dispatched 311 requests within their purview 365 days a year, 7 days a week in all areas in and surrounding the Tenderloin parks, including the exteriors to the end of the block. Grantee shall work with various city departments and other partners to coordinate their cleaning services with an aim to address negative street behaviors as well as other impediments to sidewalk conditions.

6. Safe Passage: Grantee shall provide necessary safety services for children, seniors, and residents by escorting them through the neighborhood and ensuring their safety while accessing parks, schools, community centers, programs, food pantries, senior centers, and services across the neighborhood.

7. Program Implementation: Hire, train, and deploy nine (9) Ambassadors, with priority from affected communities with lived experience. Provide thorough and comprehensive on-boarding training to staff, including specific trainings requested by City. Address performance and/or personnel issues as required and to a degree deemed acceptable by City. Ambassadors working on this grant shall be trained to and use these practices:

    a. **Basic Interventions**: Grantee shall invite the whole community to participate in creating a safe and inviting space for all by maintaining common spaces clear of debris. Ambassadors shall make a good faith effort to interrupt negative behavior in the Service Area including but not limited to public urination/defecation, littering, drug use, and general noise disturbances. Ambassador staff shall contact the local authorities for activities that may endanger the staff and public.

    b. **Space Activations**: Grantee shall plan and implement at least four (4) space activations across each park in the Tenderloin Parks Network over the course of this agreement. Activations shall be planned in advance with participation and agreement from City. Grantee shall provide a summary document outlining successes and challenges after each activation concludes.

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

c. **De-Escalation Interventions**: Ambassadors will assist with relational and other interventions to help contain mental health episodes, to reverse overdose events, to prevent or interrupt street violence, or to prevent crime so long as it does not endanger Ambassadors.

d. **Drug Activity Deterrence**: Ambassadors shall regularly engage known drug-use locations using trauma-informed, non-confrontational approaches. Ambassadors will orient the participants in these markets to the needs of the community for a drug-free zone.

e. **Resource Connections**: Ambassadors shall offer immediate aid (i.e.. administer Narcan to reverse an overdose and call 911) and connect individuals in crisis to the available housing, medical care, or treatment services available in the Service Area.

8. Reporting: Grantee will provide monthly reports to City within seven (7) calendar days of the conclusion of each month. Reports shall include, but not be limited to, deployment data (e.g. number of staff, total staff hours), outcome data for each of the above-listed service objectives, summaries of issues/challenges and how they were resolved, park visitor data, and notable events or engagements. Data shall be compiled for that corresponding month, plus cumulative totals since contract commencement. City may add additional data points for collection at any time during the course of the agreement. All monthly reports must include data for Grantee plus any additional subgrantees associated with the agreement. Grantee shall also include appropriate City department logos in any product, program, or project supported with funding from this grant, utilized with City consent.

9. Ramp-Down Planning: As requested by City and with thirty (30) days' notice, provide a strategic transition plan providing recommendations for City transition away from or reduce the number of Grantee's Ambassador resources.

10. Close-Out Report: Grantee shall provide a Close-Out Report to the City within (21) calendar days after the end of grant term. The Close-Out Report is a comprehensive and cumulative snapshot of program impact through the final day of service. The report shall include cumulative outputs of all Grantee's services provided over the course of the agreement as well as performance metrics, status of all active subcontracts for service under the grant, and recommendations for continuing the program beyond contract term should funding become available.

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Provide details about outcomes resulting from the agreement

1. At least 60% of staff members under this contract shall have lived experience with homelessness, recovery from substance abuse, and/or justice system involvement.

2. 100% of ambassadors working on this grant shall be trained in de-escalation, overdose prevention and reversal, customer service, City Street Response Coordination and City social services (provided by City), community health work, and other trainings as requested by City.

3. 90% of days under this grant, Grantee will report daily staff deployment.

4. 90% of weeks under this grant, Grantee will attend weekly meetings with DEM to allow for program supervision and discuss any required or requested deployment or operational adjustments.

5. 100% of assigned stakeholder meetings shall be attended by the Grantee.

6. 100% of monthly reporting shall be completed on or before the 15th day of each month.

7. 100% of incidents shall be reported to the City the same day the Grantee becomes aware of the matter.

SAN FRANCISCO
HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

Reporting Period (agreements executed between): 4/1/2025 and 6/30/2025

Department of Benefits and Family Support

Department of Disability and Aging Services

Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract/PO/Req PeopleSoft ID#**: 1000036173
Supplier Name: Urban Alchemy		**Supplier ID**: 0000040596
Contract Start Date: 7/1/2025	**Contract End Date**: 12/31/2025	**Funds encumbered to date**: $8,400,000

Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:

☒ Homelessness

☒ Mental Health Needs

☒ Integrated Health Needs

☒ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders

☐ Public Safety Hiring

Services provided under the contract during reporting period: This grant will fund ongoing deployment of a specialized and highly trained ambassador program for the Mid-Market, Tenderloin, and Lower Polk neighborhoods.

1. Program Management: Perform all required program, cost, and project management needs for a successful program, including but not limited to budgetary forecasting, cost and resource analysis, expense reporting, staff schedule projections, and contingency planning for all programmatic requirements.

2. Program Implementation: Hire, train, and deploy one hundred (100) Ambassadors/Practitioners, with priority from affected communities with lived experience. Provide thorough and comprehensive on-boarding training to staff, including but not limited to de-escalation, overdose prevention and reversal, customer service, City Street Response Coordination and City social services (provided by City), community health work, and others as requested by City. Address performance and/or personnel issues as required and to a degree deemed acceptable by City. Successful program implementation includes ambassadors implementing the following services:

    a. **Positive Engagements:** Ambassadors shall consistently engage with clients, staff, small businesses, and neighbors, housed and unhoused, to build positive relationships and serve as a community connector by providing clients, staff, small businesses, and neighbors with resource information and service connections. Ambassadors will provide friendly greetings and basic wayfinding services to the community.

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Trent Rhorer
Executive Director, SFHSA

Kelly Dearman
Executive Director, DAS

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

b. **Basic Interventions**: Ambassadors shall invite the whole community to participate in creating a safe and inviting space for all by maintaining common spaces clear of debris. Ambassadors shall make a good faith effort to interrupt negative behavior in the Service Area including but not limited to public urination/defecation, littering, drug use, and general noise disturbances. Ambassador staff shall contact the local authorities for activities that may endanger the staff and public.

c. **De-Escalation Interventions**: Ambassadors will assist with relational and other interventions to help contain mental health episodes, to reverse overdose events, to prevent or interrupt street violence, or to prevent crime so long as it does not endanger Ambassadors.

d. **Cleaning & Sanitation Services**: Ambassadors shall assist with trash pick-up, including needle pickup and disposal, and power washing in designated areas and as necessary. Ambassadors shall contact the appropriate City or partner resources for more significant sanitation needs.

e. **Drug Activity Deterrence**: Ambassadors shall regularly engage known drug-use locations using trauma-informed, non-confrontational approaches. Ambassadors will orient the participants in these markets to the needs of the community for a drug-free zone.

f. **Resource Connections**: Ambassadors shall offer immediate aid (i.e.. administer Narcan to reverse and overdose and call 911) and connect individuals in crisis to the available housing, medical care, or treatment services available in the Service Area.

g. **Safe Passage**: Ambassadors will provide escort and support for vulnerable residents navigating high-risk corridors.

h. **Wellness Checks**: Ambassadors shall conduct proactive wellness checks with unhoused individuals and others who are at risk, building rapport, assessing needs, and referring to support or assistance as necessary.

i. **Communications**: Deployed Ambassadors shall carry two-way radios, provided by Grantee, to ensure rapid communication and safety response.

3. Oasis Operations: The Grantee shall be responsible for operating two Oasis locations within the designated service area: one at the corner of Turk and Hyde Streets, and another on 6th Street at Jessie. These Oasis stations are intended to serve as welcoming, inclusive spaces where all community members—particularly those without access to stable shelter—can safely relax, socialize, and take refuge from the streets and from extreme weather conditions. Each site shall be open daily from 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM and staffed at all times by at

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

least two trained Practitioners, with additional supervisory personnel available during service hours.

The Grantee is responsible for all aspects of staffing and site maintenance to ensure the Oasis stations remain safe, drug-free, and aesthetically pleasing environments. Responsibilities include opening and closing the sites each day, engaging positively with community members in and around the spaces, and maintaining a calm and welcoming atmosphere. The sites shall provide essential amenities such as shade, seating, heating when safe to do so, drinking water, tea, and access to restrooms. Additional features may include dog-friendly areas and community gardens, to further promote a sense of comfort and belonging.

The Grantee shall coordinate with the City for regular servicing of on-site portable toilets and ensure general upkeep of restroom facilities. They will also be responsible for collecting and disposing of trash and debris within the Oasis locations and in the surrounding areas. The Grantee must take reasonable measures to deter drug use and other negative street behaviors and is expected to coordinate as necessary with City resources, including law enforcement and health or human services. Consumable supplies must be regularly replenished, and other mutually agreed-upon responsibilities may be added in collaboration with the City to enhance the overall quality and impact of the Oasis stations.

4. Coordination with City: Participate in regular coordination meetings with the City via daily huddles and weekly management meetings at which operational and deployment plans shall be discussed and approved by City. Participate in stakeholder and City efforts including, but not limited to, the Drug Market Agency Coordination Center (DMACC), street response coordination efforts such as Neighborhood Street Teams, utilizing the 311 and 911 systems, and others to ensure the appropriate response for different situations that may arise.

5. Reporting: Deployed Ambassadors will keep and submit daily incident and service logs to their supervisors at the conclusion of each shift, which shall be available to City upon request. Grantee will provide monthly reports to City within fifteen (15) calendar days of the conclusion of each month. Reports shall include, but not be limited to, deployment data (e.g. number of staff, total staff hours), outcome data for each of the above-listed service objectives, summaries of issues/challenges and how they were resolved, and notable events or engagements. Data shall be compiled for that corresponding month, plus cumulative totals since contract commencement. City may add additional data points for collection at any time during the course of the agreement. All monthly reports must include data for Grantee plus any additional subgrantees associated with the agreement.

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

Ramp-Down Planning: As requested by City and with thirty (30) days' notice, provide a strategic transition plan providing recommendations for City transition away from or reduce the number of Grantee's ambassador resources.

Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Provide details about outcomes resulting from the agreement

1. At least 80% of staff members under this contract shall have lived experience with homelessness, recovery from substance abuse, and/or justice system involvement.
2. 100% of ambassadors working on this grant shall be trained in de-escalation, overdose prevention and reversal, customer service, City Street Response Coordination and City social services (provided by City), community health work, and other trainings as requested by City.
3. 90% of days under this grant, Grantee will report daily staff deployment.
4. 90% of weeks under this grant, Grantee will attend weekly meetings with DEM to allow for program supervision and discuss any required or requested deployment or operational adjustments.
5. 100% of assigned stakeholder meetings shall be attended by the Grantee.
6. 100% of monthly reporting shall be completed on or before the 15th day of each month.
7. 100% of incidents shall be reported to the City the same day the Grantee becomes aware of the matter.

From:	Lau, Leslie (HSA)
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Dodge, Samuel (DEM); Zapien, Esperanza (HSA); Birmingham, Colleen (HSA); Kaplan, Daniel (HSA)
Subject:	21B Board of Supervisor Quarterly Reporting - Community Safety and Engagement Program
Date:	Thursday, July 31, 2025 4:30:37 PM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png image005.png 21B BOS Report HSA - Ahsing Solutions 7.31.2025.pdf 21B BOS Report HSA - TLCBD 7.31.2025.pdf 21B BOS Report HSA - Urban Alchemy 7.31.2025.pdf

---

Hello,

Attached is the quarterly report for the 21b grant agreements for the Community Safety and Engagement Program.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Leslie Lau
Principal Contracts Manager
Office of Contracts Management
Pronouns: He/His/Him

C: (415) 713-8590
Office Address:
1650 Mission St. Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94103

www.SFHSA.org

SAN FRANCISCO
HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors

Clerk of the Board

From: Shireen McSpadden
Executive Director
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

Date: July 31, 2025

Subject: Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing's Administrative Code Ch 21B.3 Quarterly Report

---

On February 11, 2025, the Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance No. 010-25, codified in Chapter 21B of the Administrative Code, to suspend and delegate certain approvals for Contracts and Leases necessary to accelerate the City's response to homelessness, drug overdoses and substance use disorders, mental health needs, integrated health needs, and public safety hiring (the "Core Initiatives Ordinance"). The Ordinance took effect on March 14, 2025, and included the requirement for designated departments to report quarterly on contracts and leases executed under Administrative Code Section 21B.3.

The Core Initiatives Ordinance maintained the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing's (HSH's) existing streamlined contracting authority under Administrative Code 21B (Ordinance No. 038-24), that will expire on May 5, 2029. Under this authority, the Department has continued to enter and amend agreements without adhering to provisions regarding competitive bidding related to projects addressing homelessness. Required reporting under Ordinance No. 038-24 has been incorporated into this quarterly report.

This report fulfills HSH's quarterly reporting obligations under Administrative Code 21B for the third and fourth quarters of FY2024-25[1]. The report includes all contracts, grant agreements and leases executed by HSH under Chapter 21B during the reporting period.

In Q3 and Q4 of FY2024-25, HSH entered into 4 contracts, 31 grant agreements and 1 lease agreement under Chapter 21B. These agreements supported both new and existing projects addressing homelessness across the following service areas:

- Homelessness Prevention (3)
- Housing Problem Solving (1)
- Shelter (8)
- Housing (24)

[1] This report includes contracts executed under 21B from quarter 3 of FY24-25 (January 1 – March 31, 2025) as the Ordinance went into effect in mid-March 2025.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING
Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Q3 Reporting Period (agreements executed between)1/1/2025–3/31/2025
Total: 8

Q3 a) Agreements executed under Core Initiatives Ordinance Ordinance 21B authority (3)

Program Name: Ending Transgender Homelessness – Urgent Accommodation Vouchers		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID**: 1000034397
Supplier Name: San Francisco Community Health Center		**Supplier ID**: 0000025031
Contract Start Date: 1/1/2025	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2026	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $1,366,646
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs ☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring		
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: New grant agreement for emergency short-term hotel stays and support services for vulnerable populations of adults. Serves 8-10 adults at a time.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Capital Improvements Program		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID:**1000034347
Supplier Name: Mary Elizabeth Inn		**Supplier ID:** 0000015598
Contract Start Date: 2/1/2025	**Contract End Date:** 6/30/2025	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $350,000
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs ☒ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring		
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: New grant agreement for capital improvements necessary to maintain habitability and improve functionality and suitability for residents residing at the Mary Elizabeth Inn, a permanent supportive housing site serving up to 58 adults.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service requirements and reporting requirements are included in Appendix A of the Grant Agreement.		

Program Names: Altamont and Apollo Hotel Unit Turnover Program		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID:**1000035116
Supplier Name: Mission Housing Development Corporation		**Supplier ID:** 0000014952
Contract Start Date: 2/1/2025	**Contract End Date:** 1/31/2026	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $84,000
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:		

☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs	☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: New grant agreement to address unit turnover work at existing permanent supportive housing sites, the Altamont (2 units) and Apollo Hotel (5 units).	
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service requirements and reporting requirements are included in Appendix A of the Grant Agreement	

Q3 b) Agreements executed under existing 21B Streamlined Contracting authority (5)

Program Name: Urgent Accommodation Vouchers Program for Families and Pregnant People		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID**: 1000028113
Supplier Name: Compass Family Services		**Supplier ID**: 0000022446
Contract Start Date: 2/1/2023	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2026	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $17,801,570
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs	☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring	
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue emergency hotel vouchers serving at least 80 families and pregnant people.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Vehicle Triage Center (VTC) Support Services		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID**: 1000024673
Supplier Name: Bayview Hunters Point Foundation for Community Improvement		**Supplier ID**: 0000024522
Contract Start Date: 3/1/2022	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2025	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $1,585,275
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs	☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring	
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue support services for households in up to 35 vehicles at the Bayview Vehicle Triage Center.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Aranda Hotel

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID**: 1000020629
Supplier Name: Conard House, Inc		**Supplier ID**: 0000022403
Contract Start Date: 1/1/2021	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2025	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $9,143,980

Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:

☒ Homelessness
☐ Mental Health Needs
☐ Integrated Health Needs
☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders
☐ Public Safety Hiring

Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue support services, property management, master lease stewardship for at least 110 adults in permanent supportive housing.

Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.

Program Name: Flexible Housing Subsidy Pool		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID:**1000021034
Supplier Name: Brilliant Corners		**Supplier ID:** 0000024002
Contract Start Date: 2/15/2021	**Contract End Date:** 6/30/2026	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $59,542,690

Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:

☒ Homelessness
☐ Mental Health Needs
☐ Integrated Health Needs
☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders
☐ Public Safety Hiring

Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue to provide scattered-site permanent housing services through the Flexible Housing Subsidy Pool program to 500 adult participants.

Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: New agreement for ~~d~~detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.

Program Name: Rapid Rehousing for Adults		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID:**1000020986
Supplier Name: Episcopal Community Services		**Supplier ID:** 0000020568
Contract Start Date: 2/15/2021	**Contract End Date:** 6/30/2027	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $21,524,980

Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:

☒ Homelessness
☐ Mental Health Needs
☐ Integrated Health Needs
☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders
☐ Public Safety Hiring

Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue rapid rehousing and associated housing services for up to 305 adults.

Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service requirements and reporting requirements are included in Appendix A of the Grant Agreement

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING
Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Q4 Reporting Period (agreements executed between): 4/1/2025 and 6/30/2025
Total: 27

Q4 a) Agreements executed under Core Initiatives Ordinance 21B authority (9)

Program Name: Adante Non-Congregate Shelter Services	
Agreement Type: Contract	**Contract ID**: 1000035234
Supplier Name: Five Keys Schools and Programs	**Supplier ID**: 0000011181
Contract Start Date: 4/1/2025 **Contract End Date**: 3/31/2027	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $9,717,520
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs ☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring	
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: New contract to continue to provide non-congregate shelter for up to 90 adults at the Adante Hotel.	
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.	

Program Names: Raphael House Capital	
Agreement Type: Grant	**Contract ID**: 1000035254
Supplier Name: Raphael House of San Francisco, Inc.	**Supplier ID**: 0000056216
Contract Start Date: 4/15/2025 **Contract End Date**: 6/30/2026	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $350,000
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs ☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring	
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: New grant agreement for capital improvements for family shelter program.	
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service requirements and reporting requirements are included in Appendix A of the Grant Agreement.	

Program Name: Lease and Property Management at 1321 Mission (aka The Margot)	
Agreement Type: Contract	**Contract ID**: 1000035759
Supplier Name: DISH SF	**Supplier ID**: 0000056820

Contract Start Date: 7/1/2025	**Contract End Date**: 2/16/2028	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $19,500,000

Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:

☒ Homelessness
☐ Mental Health Needs
☐ Integrated Health Needs
☒ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders
☐ Public Safety Hiring

Services provided under the contract during reporting period: New contract to continue lease and property management services at The Margot, a permanent supportive housing program serving 120 adults and 40 families.

Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in the Appendix A of the grant agreement.

Program Name: TAY Housing Ladder

Agreement Type: Grant	**Contract ID**: 1000035319
Supplier Name: The Unity Care Group	**Supplier ID**: 0000029474

Contract Start Date: 6/1/2025	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2028	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $1,575,547

Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:

☒ Homelessness
☐ Mental Health Needs
☐ Integrated Health Needs
☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders
☐ Public Safety Hiring

Services provided under the contract during reporting period: New grant agreement to provide support services to 12 young adults in the Housing Ladder program (a permanent supportive housing program).

Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in the Appendix A of the grant agreement.

Program Name: Property Management at Six Buildings

Agreement Type: Contract	**Contract ID**: 1000035491
Supplier Name: DISH SF	**Supplier ID**: 0000056820

Contract Start Date: 7/1/2025	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2026	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $9,995,897

Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing:

☒ Homelessness
☐ Mental Health Needs
☐ Integrated Health Needs
☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders
☐ Public Safety Hiring

Services provided under the contract during reporting period: New contract to continue property management and master lease stewardship for 450 units across six city-leased permanent supportive housing sites (Camelot, Empress, LeNain, Pacific Bay Inn, Star and Windsor) serving adults.

Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.

Program Name: TAY Parenting at RRH

Agreement Type: Grant	**Contract ID**: 1000035565
Supplier Name: 3rd St Youth Center & Clinic	**Supplier ID**: 0000043232

Contract Start Date: 7/1/2025	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2031	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $9,990,000
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs ☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring		
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: New grant agreement to provide rapid rehousing for 68 young adult households.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Property Management at the Minna Lee		
Agreement Type: Contract	**Contract ID**: 1000035564	
Supplier Name: DISH SF	**Supplier ID**: 0000056820	
Contract Start Date: 7/1/2025	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2027	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $3,033,934
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs ☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring		
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: New contract to continue property management and master lease stewardship for 50 units of permanent supportive housing at the Minna Lee serving adults.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Transitional Living to RRH & Rising Up		
Agreement Type: Grant	**Contract ID**: 1000035530	
Supplier Name: Larkin Street Youth Services	**Supplier ID**: 0000016602	
Contract Start Date: 7/1/2025	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2029	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $9,952,741
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs ☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring		
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: New grant agreement for rapid rehousing and associated housing services serving up to 108 young adult households.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: TAY Rapid Rehousing & Rising Up	
Agreement Type: Grant	**Contract ID**: 1000035536
Supplier Name: Five Keys Schools and Programs	**Supplier ID**: 0000011181

Contract Start Date: 7/1/2025	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2029	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $9,988,873
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs ☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring		
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: New grant agreement for rapid rehousing and associated housing services for up to 79 young adult households.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Q4 b) Agreements executed under existing 21B Streamlined Contracting authority (18)

Program Name: FEPCO Homelessness Prevention		
Agreement Type: Grant	**Contract ID:** 1000021763	
Supplier Name: Catholic Charities	**Supplier ID:** 0000023239	
Contract Start Date: 7/1/2021	**Contract End Date:** 12/31/2025	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $9,789,606
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs ☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring		
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue homeless prevention assistance for at least 200 households.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Homelessness Prevention Assistance		
Agreement Type: Grant	**Contract ID**: 1000027661	
Supplier Name: Young Community Developers	**Supplier ID**: 0000007937	
Contract Start Date:12/1/2022	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2028	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $8,978,925
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs ☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring		
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue homelessness prevention assistance for at least 98 households.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Program Name: Direct Cash Transfer		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID**: 1000026436
Supplier Name: Larkin Street Youth Services		**Supplier ID**: 0000016602
Contract Start Date: 2/1/2023	**Contract End Date**: 12/31/2025	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $2,558,251
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs		☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue a direct cash transfer program pilot for young adults experiencing homelessness.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Names: Problem-Solving Fiscal Agent		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID**: 1000026120
Supplier Name: Abode Services		**Supplier ID**: 0000040774
Contract Start Date: 8/1/2022	**Contract End Date**: 8/31/2025	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $9,900,000
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs		☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue to provide fiscal agent services to the HSH-funded grantees providing problem solving services.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Names: Emergency Pop Up Shelter		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID**: 1000026824
Supplier Name: Urban Alchemy		**Supplier ID**: 0000040596
Contract Start Date: 10/1/2022	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2028	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $2,278,523
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs		☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue emergency pop up shelter operations and services during inclement weather.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Program Name: Emergency Shelter		
Agreement Type: Grant	**Contract ID:** 1000022325	
Supplier Name: Mission Action	**Supplier ID:** 0000021257	
Contract Start Date: 7/1/2021	**Contract End Date:** 6/30/2027	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $18,529,877
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs	☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring	
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue emergency shelter services and operations for 152 shelter beds for adults experiencing homelessness.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in the Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Aarti Hotel		
Agreement Type: Grant	**Contract ID:**1000012315	
Supplier Name: Larkin Street Youth Services	**Supplier ID:** 0000016602	
Contract Start Date: 7/1/2018	**Contract End Date:** 6/30/2027	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $8,972,417
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs	☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring	
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue support services for up to 50 young adults living at the Aarti Hotel, a permanent supportive housing site.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in the Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Henry Hotel		
Agreement Type: Grant	**Contract ID:** 1000014089	
Supplier Name: Episcopal Community Services	**Supplier ID:** 0000020568	
Contract Start Date:7/1/2019	**Contract End Date:** 6/30/2027	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $20,400,596
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs	☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring	
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue support services, property management, and master lease stewardship for adults in 121 units of permanent supportive housing at the Henry Hotel.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in the Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Program Name: FHSP, RRH, EHV		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID:** 1000021032
Supplier Name: Five Keys Schools and Programs		**Supplier ID:** 0000011181
Contract Start Date: 2/15/2021	**Contract End Date:** 6/30/2026	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $6,000,000
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs		☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue housing focused case management for 145 adult households in scattered site housing programs.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in the Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Artmar Hotel		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID:** 1000021966
Supplier Name: Five Keys Schools and Programs		**Supplier ID:** 0000011181
Contract Start Date: 6/1/2021	**Contract End Date:** 6/30/2027	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $13,912,633
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs		☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue property management and support services to young adults in 60 units of permanent supportive housing at the Artmar Hotel.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in the Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Casa Esperanza		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID**: 1000024908
Supplier Name: Larkin Street Youth Services		**Supplier ID**: 0000016602
Contract Start Date: 5/1/2022	**Contract End Date**: 2/29/2028	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $1,709,021
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs		☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue support services for 25 young adults at Casa Esperanza, a permanent supportive housing site.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Mission Inn

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID**: 1000024464
Supplier Name: Larkin Street Youth Services		**Supplier ID**: 0000016602
Contract Start Date: 5/1/2022	**Contract End Date**: 2/29/2028	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $3,194,932
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs		☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue support services for 50 young adults at Mission Inn, a permanent supportive housing site.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: 835 Turk Support Services		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID**: 1000025061
Supplier Name: Five Keys Schools and Programs		**Supplier ID**: 0000011181
Contract Start Date: 6/1/2022	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2026	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $2,579,924
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs		☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue support services for 114 formerly homeless adults at the Gotham, a permanent supportive housing site.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Adult Rapid Rehousing		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID**: 1000027996
Supplier Name: Abode Services		**Supplier ID**: 0000040774
Contract Start Date: 1/1/2023	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2027	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $18,402,770
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs		☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue rapid rehousing and associated housing services for up to 240 adults.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Adult Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHV)

Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID**: 1000027995
Supplier Name: Abode Services		**Supplier ID**: 0000040774
Contract Start Date: 7/1/2023	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2028	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $5,320,468
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs		☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue support services to at least 104 adults in the Emergency Housing Voucher program.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in the Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Verona Hotel		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID**: 1000033331
Supplier Name: Abode Property Management		**Supplier ID**: 0000050037
Contract Start Date: 7/1/2024	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2027	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $6,659,496
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs		☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue property management and master lease stewardship services for 65 adults at the Verona Hotel, a permanent supportive housing site.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Property Management at the Auburn		
Agreement Type: Grant		**Contract ID**: 1000035561
Supplier Name: DISH SF		**Supplier ID**: 0000056820
Contract Start Date: 7/1/2025	**Contract End Date**: 6/30/2027	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE)**: $2,805,022
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs		☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: New grant agreement to continue property management services for 70 units of permanent supportive housing at the Aubern Hotel serving adults.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Program Name: Supportive Housing Assistance and Readiness Efforts	
Agreement Type: Grant	**Contract ID:** 1000021498

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Supplier Name: Homeless Prenatal Program		**Supplier ID:** 0000018733
Contract Start Date: 7/1/2021	**Contract End Date:** 6/30/2029	**Total Not to Exceed (NTE):** $22,627,326
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs		☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under the contract during reporting period: Grant amendment to continue rapid rehousing and associated housing services to up to 60 families.		
Measurable outcomes related to the contract during reporting period: Detailed service and outcome objectives are included in Appendix A of the grant agreement.		

Q4 Reporting Period (leases executed between): 4/1/2025 and 6/30/2025

Total: 1

Agreement Type: Lease	**City-as-tenant or City-as-landlord:** Tenant
New Lease or Amendment: Amendment	**Contracting Party Name:** 33 Gough LLC
Annual Base Rent: $1,127,000	**Contracting Party ID:** E1000017615
Lease Start Date: 5/1/2025	**Lease End Date:** 3/13/2027
Applicable Core Initiative for this project addressing: ☒ Homelessness ☐ Mental Health Needs ☐ Integrated Health Needs	☐ Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders ☐ Public Safety Hiring
Services provided under lease during reporting period: 2nd amendment to the lease between the City and 33 Gough LLC to continue the non-congregate cabin program (33 Gough Cabin Program) serving up to 74 adults experiencing homelessness.	

Measurable outcomes related to lease during reporting period: n/a

Item 19

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)
Subject:	FW: Issued – Rec and Park: Lifetime Tennis, Inc., dba Lifetime Activities, Which Operates the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center, Generally Complied With Gross Receipts Reporting but Underpaid $10,593 in Rent for March 3, 2021, Through March 31, 2023
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:35:00 AM
Attachments:	image004.png image005.png image006.png

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below link to a Controller City Services Auditor report.

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: Reports, Controller (CON) <controller.reports@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:24 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Cc: delaRosa, Mark (CON) <mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org>; Vo, Helen (CON) <helen.vo@sfgov.org>; Woo, Winnie (CON) <winnie.woo@sfgov.org>; Tam, Kristen (CON) <kristen.tam@sfgov.org>
Subject: Issued – Rec and Park: Lifetime Tennis, Inc., dba Lifetime Activities, Which Operates the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center, Generally Complied With Gross Receipts Reporting but Underpaid $10,593 in Rent for March 3, 2021, Through March 31, 2023

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to the San Francisco Charter, Section 3.105 and Appendix F, and Administrative Code, Chapter 10.6-2, the Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor today issued a report on its audit of the agreement between the City and County of San Francisco (City), through its Recreation and Park Department (Rec and Park), and Lifetime Tennis, Inc., dba Lifetime Activities (Lifetime) for the operation and management of the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center.

Please refer to the distribution e-mail below.

Office of the Controller

City & County of San Francisco

Alternate text

The Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) today issued a report on its audit of the agreement between the City and County of San Francisco (City), through its Recreation and Park Department (Rec and Park), and Lifetime Tennis, Inc., dba Lifetime Activities (Lifetime) for the operation and management of the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center. The audit found that Lifetime materially complied with its reporting requirements and payment obligations under the operating agreement. However, Lifetime underreported its gross receipts by $310,003, which caused it to underpay rent by $10,593. The audit also found that Rec and Park generally fulfilled its obligations in monitoring Lifetime's operations under the operating agreement.

View the full report

Image

Sign up to receive news and updates

Search all Controller's Office reports

This is a send-only e-mail address.

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

For media queries, please contact Communications Manager Alyssa Sewlal at alyssa.sewlal@sfgov.org or (415) 694-3261.

Manage your preferences | Opt Out using TrueRemove™
Got this as a forward? Sign up to receive our future emails.
View this email online.

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place | San Francisco, CA 94102 US

This email was sent to controller.reports@sfgov.org.
To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.

City & County of San Francisco

Lifetime Tennis, Inc., dba Lifetime Activities, Which Operates the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center, Generally Complied With Gross Receipts Reporting but Underpaid $10,593 in Rent for March 3, 2021, Through March 31, 2023

Recreation and Park Department

Prepared by

OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY SERVICES AUDITOR

August 12, 2025

About the Controller's Office

The Controller is the chief financial officer and auditor for the City and County of San Francisco. We produce regular reports on the City's financial condition, economic condition, and the performance of City government. We strive to be a model for good government and to make the City a better place to live and work.

About the Audits Division

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

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

Team:
Winnie Woo, *Audit Manager*

Consultant:
Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, Inc.

For more information, please contact:
Mark de la Rosa
Director of Audits
Office of the Controller
City and County of San Francisco
(415) 554-7574

Media inquiries:
con.media@sfgov.org
sf.gov/controller
@sfcontroller
Controller's Office LinkedIn

OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Greg Wagner
Controller

ChiaYu Ma
Deputy Controller

August 12, 2025

Recreation and Park Commission
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager
Recreation and Park Department
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

Dear Commission President, Commissioners, and General Manager Ginsburg:

The Office of the Controller (Controller), City Services Auditor (CSA), Audits Division, presents its report on the audit of the agreement between the City and County of San Francisco (City), through its Recreation and Park Department (Rec and Park), and Lifetime Tennis, Inc., dba Lifetime Activities (Lifetime) for the operation and management of the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center. The audit had as its objectives to determine whether Lifetime complied with the reporting requirements and payment obligations of the agreement for March 3, 2021, through March 31, 2023. CSA engaged Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, Inc., (SEC) to conduct the audit.

The audit found that Lifetime materially complied with its reporting requirements and payment obligations under the operating agreement. However, Lifetime underreported its gross receipts by $310,003, which caused it to underpay rent by $10,593. The audit also found that Rec and Park generally fulfilled its obligations in monitoring Lifetime's operations under the operating agreement. The responses of Rec and Park and Lifetime are attached to this report.

CSA and SEC appreciate the assistance and cooperation of Rec and Park and Lifetime staff involved in this audit. For questions about the report, please contact me at mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org or 415-554-5393 or CSA at 415-554-7469.

Respectfully,

Mark de la Rosa
Director of Audits

cc: Board of Supervisors
Budget Analyst
Citizens Audit Review Board
City Attorney
Civil Grand Jury
Mayor
Public Library

Recreation and Park Department: Lifetime Tennis, Inc., dba Lifetime Activities, Which Operates the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center, Generally Complied With Gross Receipts Reporting but Underpaid $10,593 in Rent for March 3, 2021, Through March 31, 2023

May 2025

SJOBERG EVASHENK CONSULTING, INC

455 Capitol Mall • Suite 700 • Sacramento, California • 95814 • Tel 916.443.1300 • Fax 916.443.1350

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the Audit

The City and County of San Francisco (City), through its Recreation and Park Department (Rec and Park) entered into an Operating Agreement (Agreement) with Lifetime Tennis, Inc., dba Lifetime Activities (Lifetime) for the operation and management of the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center. The Agreement commenced on March 3, 2021, and ends on March 31, 2029. The audit assessed whether 1) Lifetime complied with the reporting of Gross Receipts and payment of Percentage Rent, and 2) Rec and Park complied with relevant requirements for monitoring and administering the Agreement for the audit period of March 3, 2021, through March 31, 2023.

Highlights

According to the Agreement, Lifetime must report Gross Receipts to Rec and Park quarterly and pay Percentage Rent of 5% of Gross receipts for the 12 months ended March 31, 2023. The Department is responsible for receiving and reviewing the statements and payments. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Lifetime was neither required to pay rent before April 1, 2022, nor to pay any base rent during the audit period.

The audit found that Rec and Park fulfilled its obligations in administering and monitoring the Agreement, and Lifetime complied in all material respects with the Agreement's reporting requirements and payment obligations. However, Lifetime reported $310,003 less in Gross Receipts than its underlying records, resulting in an underpayment of $10,593 in rent to the City and did not always submit required statements and rent payments on time.

The audit also found that, as of the audit's commencement, Lifetime had neither reported nor remitted to the State of California certain sales tax collections on its taxable sales. These unremitted sales tax collections are deemed to be Gross Receipts until remitted to the state, so affect the calculation of rent. Although Lifetime revised its sales tax returns through June 30, 2024, before we completed the audit, any unremitted tax collections could affect future Gross Receipts and rent calculations.

Recommendations

To improve Lifetime's compliance with the Agreement, Rec and Park should:

1. Require Lifetime to implement adequate internal controls to capture and report its Gross Receipts subject to Percentage Rent in accordance with the Agreement.
2. Collect from Lifetime the underpaid rent of $10,593 and related late charges of $530 required by the Agreement for March 3, 2021, through March 31, 2023.
3. Reevaluate and modify Lifetime's reporting deadlines for the non-financial and statistical information to better align with current business practice and its newer operating agreements and leases. Consider establishing separate deadlines for these reports.
4. Remind Lifetime to implement controls to identify and report all taxable sales to the State of California.

INTRODUCTION

Audit Authority

The operating agreement (Agreement) for the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center (Tennis Center) between the City and County of San Francisco (City) and Lifetime Tennis Inc., dba Lifetime Activities (Lifetime) authorizes the City and its representatives to audit all books and records established under the Agreement. The San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 10.6-2, grants the Office of the Controller (Controller) the authority to audit departments to ensure they adequately manage their agreements for leased property. Also, the San Francisco Charter provides the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) with broad authority to conduct audits. This audit was conducted under these authorities and pursuant to an audit plan agreed to by the Controller and the Recreation and Park Department (Rec and Park). CSA engaged Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, Inc., (SEC) to audit the Agreement, under which Lifetime operates the Tennis Center, and to assess Rec and Park's management of the Agreement.

Background

The City, through Rec and Park, and Lifetime entered into the Agreement, which requires Lifetime to operate the Tennis Center—now known as the Lisa and Douglas Goldman Tennis Center. The agreement has a commencement date of March 3, 2021, and a non-renewable term that ends on March 31, 2029.

The Agreement provides that Lifetime will pay zero Base Rent through March 31, 2021, zero Percentage Rent through March 31, 2022, and Percentage Rent of five percent (5%) of Gross Receipts on a quarterly basis for all quarterly periods after March 31, 2022.

The Agreement further provides that Lifetime must report its Gross Receipts and certain other required statistical information and pay required Percentage Rent within ten days of the end of each calendar quarter. The Agreement defines Gross Receipts as "*...all amounts received and receivable from all sales and business conducted in, from, or attributable to the Premise by Operator.*"

Rec and Park is responsible for administering and monitoring the operating agreement.

Objectives and Scope

The objective of the audit was to determine whether Lifetime complied with the operating agreement by correctly reporting Gross Receipts and remitting rent for the audit period of March 3, 2021, through March 31, 2023.

Specifically, the audit determined whether:

1. Lifetime's system of internal control over operating activities and receipts was adequate, and its financial data used to calculate quarterly Gross Receipts and Percentage Rent payments was reliable.

2. Lifetime's Gross Receipts and Percentage Rent were reported accurately under the terms of the Agreement.
3. Lifetime's payment of Percentage Rent complied with the terms of the Agreement.
4. Rec and Park effectively managed the Agreement as it relates to accepting and reviewing required reports and Percentage Rent payments.

Methodology

To conduct the audit, we reviewed the applicable provisions of the Agreement to identify relevant provisions on reporting Gross Receipts and other statistical information, and the payment of Base Rent and Percentage Rent. We also interviewed Lifetime and Rec and Park personnel.

To determine whether Lifetime correctly reported its annual Gross Receipts and remitted rent, we:

- Assessed Lifetime's internal controls over sales activity and compared receipts reported to Rec and Park to amounts recorded in Lifetime's records and quarterly statements of Gross Receipts.
- Recalculated all reported Gross Receipts and quarterly Percentage Rent. We then compared the recalculated Percentage Rent payments due to the actual payments Lifetime remitted to determine any over/under payments.
- Tested the timeliness of Lifetime's reporting of Gross Receipts and other required statistical information and the payment of required Percentage Rent to Rec and Park.
- Assessed whether Rec and Park complied with its policies and procedures in reviewing quarterly reports and Percentage Rent payments submitted by Lifetime.

Compliance With Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

AUDIT RESULTS

Summary

For the period of March 3, 2021, through March 31, 2023, Lifetime complied in all material respects with the Agreement's reporting requirements and payment obligations. Lifetime reported Gross Receipts of $8,572,558 and paid $228,520 in rent to the City. However, Lifetime did not accurately calculate Gross Receipts as required by its Agreement, resulting in an underpayment of rent, and did not meet the Agreement's reporting deadlines. The audit also found that Rec and Park complied with relevant operating requirements for administering and monitoring the Agreement.

Lifetime Underreported Gross Receipts and Underpaid Rent by $10,593

Agreement Section 5.4 requires Lifetime to report Gross Receipts defined as "…all amounts *received and receivable from all sales and business conducted in*, from or attributable to the Premises by Operator" with exclusions allowed for returns and refunds along with related amounts of sales tax or similar taxes.

As shown in Exhibit 1, Lifetime reported $310,003 less in Gross Receipts than it received and recorded in underlying records. This resulted in underpaid rent of $10,593 and $530 in late charges, totaling $11,123, for the audit period. According to Lifetime's records, the discrepancy was primarily attributable to the timing of receipt recognition whereby Lifetime reported Gross Receipts from sales when earned rather than when receipts were *"received and receivable"* as defined by the Agreement. For instance, credits issued for weather-related cancellations or the sale of gift certificates were reported as Gross Receipts at the time of redemption, a factor that impacted the timing of Gross Receipts reporting. Per the Agreement, Gross Receipts must include amounts both received *and* receivable from all sales. The use of "and" rather than "or" indicates that all sales should be reported regardless of the timing of redemption.

Exhibit 1: Gross Receipts Reported and Rent Paid by Lifetime, March 1, 2021, Through March 31, 2023

Period	Gross Receipts Reported	Gross Receipts (Per Lifetime Transaction Records)	Gross Receipts Over/ (Under)	Rent Paid Per City Records	Rent Calculation (Per Auditor)	Rent Paid Over/(Under)
	A	**B**	**C=B-A**	**D**	**E**	**F=E-D**
March 3, 2021 - March 31, 2022	$4,002,158	$4,100,307	**(**$98,149)	**--**	**--**	**--**
April 1, 2022 - March 31, 2023	$4,570,400	4,782,254	**(**$211,854)	$228,520	$239,113	($10,593)
Totals	**$8,572,558**	**$8,882,561**	**($310,003)**	**$228,520**	**$239,113**	**($10,593)**

Source: Lifetime's Certification of Gross Receipts and underlying fiscal records

According to Rec and Park, Lifetime captured and reported Gross Receipts using revenue recognition methodology based on generally acceptable accounting principles whereby revenue is recognized when earned, not when received. The Agreement does not address the revenue recognition methodology to be used; thus, the finding is based on the determination that not *"all amounts received and receivable"* were reported as defined in the Agreement.

Agreement Section 5.8 states that if Lifetime does not pay Rent and/or submit a Quarterly Gross Receipts Statement by the date due and payable, the unpaid amount will be subject to a late payment charge equal to five percent (5%) of the amount due." According to the provisions of the Agreement, Lifetime owes the City $530 in late charges based on the underreported Gross Receipts subject to late charges as shown in Exhibit 2.

Exhibit 2: Late Charges on Underreported Gross Receipts, March 1, 2021, Through March 31, 2023

	Period Ended March 31	
	2022	**2023**
Underreported Gross Receipts	$98,149	$211,854
Percentage Rent Owed to City	0%	5%
Underpaid Rent	-	$10,593
Late Charges on Underpaid Rent	**-**	***$530***

Lifetime Missed Deadlines for Seven of Eight Reporting Periods, but the Deadlines Are Inconsistent With Those in Other Rec and Park Agreements

Agreement Section 5.7(a) requires Lifetime to do quarterly reporting and Section 5.7(c) requires it to submit an Annual Gross Receipts Report, Annual Income and Operations Report, and Annual Allocation of Use Report. Further, Agreement Section 5.4 requires Lifetime to submit a statement to the City showing taxes paid and Gross Receipts received for each three-month period or on before the ***tenth day*** of the fourth month. The statements must be certifed as true and correct and are to be used to determine the percentage rent payable for each quarter.

Lifetime met its reporting deadline in only one of the eight reporting periods during the audit period, although Rec and Park did grant Lifetime extensions in writing. Lifetime explained to us that the non-financial and statistical information is much more difficult to accumulate and report than are Gross Receipts and the related calculation of Percentage Rent. Specifically, the information Lifetime must report quarterly to Rec and Park includes the:

- Number of San Francisco resident players
- Number of non-resident players
- Types of lessons and programs provided
- Number of adult, senior, and youth players
- Number of pickleball players
- Types of camps provided and a breakdown of the age and skill level of participants
- United States Tennis Association (USTA) teams
- Court use hours
- Vacant court hours

Acccording to Rec and Park, the department's newer agreements with other operators provide more time for operators to provide such reports. Because Lifetime asserted that it found it difficult to compile the required data and that Rec and Park has previously granted extensions, the department should reevaluate Lifetime's reporting deadlines and make them consistent with those in its other agreements.

Lifetime Prepared Inaccurate Sales Tax Returns, Which Increases the Risk of Gross Receipts Being Underreported to the City

In testing Lifetime's Gross Receipts, the audit found that Lifetime had not reported $2,045 of taxable sales to the State of California since March 3, 2021. Because amounts Lifetime did not remit to the state would be included in the calculation of Gross Receipts upon which the 5 percent rent payment is calcaluated, the amount of rent Lifetime owed to the City could be affected. Lifetime's error was likely caused by systemic reporting misstatements that omitted some taxable sales categories from the calculation that Lifetime used to determine its sale tax remittance to the state. After we discussed the issue with Lifetime, it recalculated the amounts due and submitted revised sales tax returns to the state for the quarters during March 31, 2021, through June 30, 2024, and gave us copies of the revised returns. Had Lifetime not revised its sales tax returns, we would have deemed the amount of sales taxes it collected on the unreported sales to be additional Gross Receipts subject to Percentage Rent.

Recommendations

To improve Lifetime's compliance with the operating agreement for the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center, the Recreation and Park Department should:

1. Require Lifetime to implement adequate internal controls to capture and report its Gross Receipts subject to Percentage Rent in accordance with the operating agreement.
2. Collect from Lifetime the underpaid rent of $10,593 and related late charges of $530 for March 3, 2021, through March 31, 2023.
3. Reevaluate and modify Lifetime's reporting deadlines for the non-financial and statistical information to better align with current business practice and its newer operating agreements and leases. Consdier establishing separate deadlines for these reports.
4. Remind Lifetime to implement controls to identify and report all taxable sales to the State of California.

Appendix A: Recreation and Park Department Response

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

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

July 10, 2025

Mark de la Rosa
Director of Audits
City Hall, Room 476
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: Golden Gate Park Tennis Center Audit

Dear Mr. de la Rosa,

This letter is in response to the report prepared by the Office of the Controller, City Services Auditor Division, titled "Lifetime Tennis, Inc., dba Lifetime Activities, Which Operates the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center, Generally Complied With Gross Receipts Reporting but Underpaid $10,593 in Rent for March 3, 2021, Through March 31, 2023," dated May 2025.

San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department has carefully reviewed the findings and recommendations. Our response is included in the attached Recommendation and Response form. We truly appreciate your staff's time throughout this process and your partnership in advancing our efforts to improve reporting requirements and payment obligations across all our agreements.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
AF27F65967094...

Phil Ginsburg
General Manager
San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department

Cc: Antonio Guerra, Director of Administration and Finance
Dana Ketcham, Director of Property Management, Permits and Reservations

McLaren Lodge in Golden Gate Park | 501 Stanyan Street | San Francisco, CA 94117 | PHONE: (415) 831-2700 | WEB: sfrecpark.org

Recommendations and Responses

For each recommendation, the responsible agency should indicate in the column labeled ***Agency Response*** whether it concurs, does not concur, or partially concurs and provide a brief explanation. If it concurs with the recommendation, it should indicate the expected implementation date and implementation plan. If the responsible agency does not concur or partially concurs, it should provide an explanation and an alternate plan of action to address the identified issue.

Recommendation	Agency Response	CSA Use Only Status Determination*
The Recreation and Park Department should:		
1. Require Lifetime to implement adequate internal controls to capture and report its Gross Receipts subject to Percentage Rent in accordance with the operating agreement.	☐ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☒ Partially Concur Lifetime captured and reported Gross Receipts subject to Percentage Rent based on generally accepted accounting principles, which state that revenue must be recognized when earned, not when received. The audit interprets the operating agreement as requiring cash accrual accounting which is not how the City calculates its own revenue. RPD does not concur that Lifetime calculated Gross Receipts subject to Percentage Rent incorrectly. However, based on the alternative interpretation in this audit, RPD has required Lifetime to capture and report Gross Receipts in this manner on an ongoing basis. Lifetime's previous financial system calculated revenue recognition when earned, based on GAAP. Lifetime now has a new system which can also report out using cash accrual accounting and will report revenue this way into the future.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested

Recommendation	Agency Response	CSA Use Only Status Determination*
The Recreation and Park Department should:		
2. Collect from Lifetime the underpaid rent of $10,593 and related late charges of $530 for March 3, 2021, through March 31, 2023.	☐ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☒ Partially Concur Because Lifetime captured and reported Gross Receipts subject to Percentage Rent based on generally accepted accounting principles, RPD does not concur that Lifetime underpaid rent. The audit interprets the operating agreement as requiring cash accrual accounting, resulting in underpaid rent of $10,593 and related late charges of $530 for March 3, 2021, through March 31, 2023. While cash accrual accounting is not how the City calculates its own revenue, RPD concurs that it will collect from Lifetime this additional revenue.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested
3. Reevaluate and modify Lifetime's reporting deadlines for the non-financial and statistical information to better align with current business practice and its newer operating agreements and leases. Consdier establishing separate deadlines for these reports.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur As mentioned in the report "Lifetime met its reporting deadline in only one of the eight reporting periods during the audit period, although Rec and Park did grant Lifetime extensions in writing." RPD will "reevaluate Lifetime's reporting deadlines and make them consistent with those in its other agreements."	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested

Recommendation	Agency Response	CSA Use Only Status Determination*
The Recreation and Park Department should:		
4. Remind Lifetime to implement controls to identify and report all taxable sales to the State of California.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur RPD concurs since "amounts Lifetime did not remit to the state would be included in the calculation of Gross Receipts upon which the 5 percent rent payment is calculated, the amount of rent Lifetime owed to the City could be affected." RPD has reminded Lifetime to implement controls to identify and report all taxable sales and as mentioned in the report Lifetime "recalculated the amounts due and submitted revised sales tax returns to the state for the quarters during March 31, 2021, through June 30, 2024."	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested

Lifetime Tennis, Inc., dba Lifetime Activities Response

Lifetime Activities

Excellence in Community Activities

Bestsy Kemp, Director of Operations
Lifetime Tennis, Inc., dba Lifetime Activities
Lisa and Douglas Goldman Tennis Center
50 Bowling Green Drive
San Francisco, CA 94117

August 6, 2025

Mark de la Rosa, Director of Audits
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 476
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
c/o cathy@secteam.com and winnie.woo@sfgov.org

Dear Mr. de la Rosa,

This letter is in reference to the report titled "***Lifetime Tennis, Inc., dba Lifetime Activities, Which Operates the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center, Generally Complied With Gross Receipts Reporting but Underpaid $10,593 in Rent for March 3, 2021, Through March 31, 2023***" received by Lifetime Activities in July 2025.

Upon review of the report, our response to the information is as follows:

1. **Finding:** ***Lifetime Underreported Gross Receipts and Underpaid Rent by $10,593***
   Recommendations:
   - ***Require Lifetime to implement adequate internal controls to capture and report its Gross Receipts subject to Percentage Rent in accordance with the operating agreement.***
   - ***Collect from Lifetime the underpaid rent of $10,593 and related late charges of $530 for March 3, 2021, through March 31, 2023.***

Response:
From March 2021 through October 2024, Lifetime Activities calculated Gross Receipts based on sales reporting provided by Club Automation. The reporting capability of the Club Automation system presented limitations in its ability to clearly distinguish sales between cash and accrual basis, thus reporting was done on an accrual basis. In October of 2024, Lifetime Activities switched to CourtReserve, a new system which is able to delineate sales in a manner that better aligns with RPD's expectations. Lifetime would like to work with RPD to ensure that the language in the Agreement aligns with the interpretation of both parties so as to facilitate improved compliance, specifically in the calculation of percentage rent moving forward. Lifetime Activities agrees to provide payment to SF RPD for $10,593 and $530 in late fees for the subsequent underreporting provided between March 2021 and March 2023. Lifetime Activities will take direction from SF RPD with regard to payment details.

2. **Finding:** ***Lifetime Missed Deadlines for Seven of Eight Reporting Periods, but the Deadlines Are Inconsistent With Those in Other Rec and Park Agreements***
   Recommendation:
   - ***Reevaluate and modify Lifetime's reporting deadlines for the non-financial and statistical information to better align with current business practice and its newer operating agreements and leases. Consider establishing separate deadlines for these reports.***

Response:
Lifetime Activities accepts the finding that reporting deadlines were missed in seven out of eight reporting periods. Lifetime appreciates the extensions granted by RPD and will continue to make every effort to meet stated reporting deadlines until otherwise instructed by RPD.

3. **Finding:** ***Lifetime Prepared Inaccurate Sales Tax Returns, Which Increases the Risk of Gross Receipts Being Underreported to the City***
   Recommendation:
   - ***Remind Lifetime to implement controls to identify and report all taxable sales to the State of California.***

Response:
Lifetime Activities has corrected the inaccurately calculated sales tax for the said period and submitted revised sales tax returns to address the above finding. Since then, Lifetime has worked closely with the CDTFA to ensure operations and sales are compliant with regard to present and future sales tax reporting.

Lifetime Activities thanks the audit team and appreciates their time and effort in helping improve compliance with the terms of the Agreement. Lifetime Activities remains committed to ensuring compliance with the Agreement and working with SF RPD to ensure alignment in expectations with regard to the operation and management of the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center (Lisa & Douglas Goldman Tennis Center).

Sincerely,

Betsy Kemp
Director of Operations
Lifetime Activities: San Francisco

cc: Isabella Feinberg, Chief Operating Officer
Mary Pat Patrick, Director of Administration and Human Resources

Item 20

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: FY 2024-25 Annual Gifts Report - City Administrator
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:45:00 AM
Attachments:	2025.7.21_CAO Annual Gift Report to BOS_Final.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Office of the City Administrator, submitting an Annual Gifts Report pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.100-305(c).

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: Po, Vivian (ADM) <vivian.po@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2025 3:56 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hayward, Sophie (ADM) <sophie.hayward@sfgov.org>; Petrucione, Katharine (ADM) <katharine.petrucione@sfgov.org>
Subject: FY 2024-25 Annual Gifts Report - City Administrator

Madam Clerk,

Please see attached for the Cover Letter and the Annual Gift Report from the Office of the City Administrator and our agencies, as well as funds managed by our office.

Thank you very much. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Vivian Po (she/her)
Director of Central Office and Engagement
Office of the City Administrator
City & County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 362

Sign up here to receive the City Administrator's newsletter.

City & County of San Francisco
Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Office of the City Administrator
Carmen Chu, City Administrator

July 17, 20205

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Annual Gifts Report from the Office of the City Administrator

Dear Madame Clerk:
Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 10.100-305(c), the Office of the City Administrator submits this report to document gifts received by the Office of the City Administrator and departments, divisions, programs (referred to as agencies below) and funds managed by the City Administrator in Fiscal Year 2024-2025.

This report consists of two sections. Section 1 reports gifts received by the Office of the City Administrator and its agencies. Section 2 reports gifts received by funds managed by the Office of the City Administrator.

It is important to note:

- Gifts received by the Department of Technology (DT) are not included in this report. DT submitted a separate Fiscal Year 2024-25 gift report.
- Donations made to the Disaster and Emergency Response and Recovery Fund (DERRF) under the Give2SF program are included in Section 2. The same information is also included in a separate report submitted to the Board of Supervisors by the City Administrator's Office and the Controller's Office, pursuant to Administrative Code Section 10.100-100.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Vivian Po with the City Administrator's Office at vivian.po@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

Katharine E. Petrucione
Deputy City Administrator

SECTION 1: Gifts received by the Office of the City Administrator and agencies managed by the City Administrator

The following departments, divisions, and programs received gifts between July 1, 2024 and June 30, 2025. Details provided below.

1. San Francisco Animal Care and Control (ACC)
2. Central Administration – Central Office and Engagement
3. Community Challenge Grant (CCG)
4. Convention Facilities
5. Digital and Data Services (DDS)
6. Grants for the Arts (GFTA)
7. Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA)
8. Office of Contract Administration (OCA)

The following departments, divisions and programs received no gifts between July 1, 2024 and June 30, 2025.

- 311
- Central Administration – Accounting, Budget and Planning, Human Resources, IT, Contracts & Procurement, Special Projects
- Central Shop/Fleet Management
- City Hall Building Management
- City Hall Events
- Committee on Information Technology (COIT)
- Contract Monitoring Division (CMD)
- County Clerk
- Entertainment Commission
- Government Operations Recovery Initiative (Gov Ops)
- Mayor's Office on Disability (MOD)（Transferred to HSA-DAS beginning April 1, 2025)
- Office of Cannabis (OOC)
- Office of Labor Standards Enforcement (OLSE)
- Office of Resilience and Capital Planning (ORCP)
- Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (OCME)
- Permit Center
- Real Estate Division
- ReproMail
- Risk Management
- Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA)

1. **San Francisco Animal Care and Control（ACC）**

Please note that the donations listed below include both those received at the Animal Care and Control facility and those made via web donations at the time that donors purchased online dog licenses. In addition, SF Animal Care and Control received in-kind donations from individuals.

Donor's Name	Description	Value	Donation Date
Abram Coetsee	Monetary Donation	$10.00	3/4/2025
Academy Of Sciences	Behind the scenes tour, estimated value $184	$184.00	10/15/2024
Adrianna Murillo	Monetary Donation	$25.00	2/12/2025

Aimee Erlich	Monetary Donation	$15.00	12/2/2024
Akhila Kolesar	Monetary Donation	$5.00	9/5/2024
Akira Kobayashi	Monetary Donation	$33.00	10/16/2024
Alan Delamora	Monetary Donation	$1.00	11/6/2024
Alan Terry	Monetary Donation	$21.00	7/7/2024
Alanna Marconi	Monetary Donation	$25.00	4/1/2025
Albert Patterson	Monetary Donation	$1.00	1/14/2025
Alex Kwan	Monetary Donation	$175.00	2/20/2025
Alina Hansen	Monetary Donation	$26.00	10/12/2024
Allison Sander	Monetary Donation	$95.00	6/12/2025
Allison Savage	Monetary Donation	$10.00	11/15/2024
Alycia Clatworthy	Monetary Donation	$70.00	10/14/2024
Alyssa Yousif	Monetary Donation	$10.00	10/3/2024
Amanda Perrot	Monetary Donation	$200.00	2/23/2025
Amanda Scott	Monetary Donation	$24.00	5/27/2025
Amanda Treleaven	Monetary Donation	$41.00	7/1/2024
Ammala Elizabeth Block	Monetary Donation	$10.00	9/4/2024
Anadel Fox	Monetary Donation	$10.00	5/4/2025
Andrea Butkovic	Monetary Donation	$20.00	2/14/2025
Andrea Goranson	Monetary Donation	$100.00	5/1/2025
Andrea Melara	Monetary Donation	$20.00	6/8/2025
Andrea/Sami Salinas/Kitmitto	Monetary Donation	$50.00	12/1/2024
Andy Alamano	Monetary Donation	$39.00	5/28/2025
Angela Hallinan	Monetary Donation	$50.00	7/8/2024
Angela Quong	Monetary Donation	$85.00	8/30/2024
Anita Weissberg	Monetary Donation	$15.50	5/12/2025
Anna Ayzatskaya	Monetary Donation	$15.00	11/6/2024
Anna Haemel	Monetary Donation	$10.00	1/18/2025
Anne Cook	Monetary Donation	$12.00	12/30/2024
Anne Subercaseaux	Pet Supplies	$30.00	9/4/2024
Anthony Maszeroski	Monetary Donation	$100.00	11/1/2024
Anu Menon	Monetary Donation	$10.00	12/17/2024
Armanino Advisory LLC	Pet Toys	$25.00	3/26/2025
Arnaud Tisset	Monetary Donation	$30.00	8/1/2024
Ashleigh Harris	Monetary Donation	$10.00	7/9/2024
Ashley Smith	Monetary Donation	$100.00	10/12/2024
Astor Leung	Monetary Donation	$50.00	2/2/2025

Aubrey Vance	Monetary Donation	$25.00	9/7/2024
Austin Carpenter	Monetary Donation	$20.00	8/3/2024
Ayako Tokumine	Monetary Donation	$50.00	4/25/2025
Barbara Sanchez	Monetary Donation	$20.00	3/3/2025
Berenice Mendez	Monetary Donation	$20.00	6/12/2025
Beverly Cristobal	Monetary Donation	$3.00	2/23/2025
Blue & Gold Fleet San Francisco Bay Cruise	2 tickets to Bay Cruise, estimated value $80	$80.00	10/15/2024
Bonjean Koo	Monetary Donation	$20.00	9/19/2024
Brad Smith	Monetary Donation	$10.00	11/1/2024
Brian Jesson	Monetary Donation	$100.00	2/2/2025
Bridget Wagner	Monetary Donation	$10.00	3/6/2025
Bridgette Myers	Monetary Donation	$5.00	10/26/2024
Brittney Nared	Monetary Donation	$20.00	1/7/2025
Brooke Roberts	Monetary Donation	$41.00	10/3/2024
C. Todd Norris	Monetary Donation	$5.00	8/9/2024
Callen Evans Williams	Monetary Donation	$20.00	11/11/2024
Camille Samuels	Monetary Donation	$39.00	5/13/2025
Cara Coburn	Pet Food	$90.00	1/13/2025
Carol Baker	Monetary Donation	$77.00	3/27/2025
Carol Baker	Monetary Donation	$50.00	9/9/2024
Carol Kopko	Pet Supplies	$165.00	9/15/2024
Catherine Alex Reading	Monetary Donation	$12.00	7/9/2024
Catherine Talbot	Monetary Donation	$100.00	6/13/2025
Cathy Ng	Monetary Donation	$50.00	1/25/2025
Cecelia Beam	Monetary Donation	$100.00	6/11/2025
Cecilia Torres	Monetary Donation	$20.00	3/16/2025
Charlene Tobin	Monetary Donation	$50.00	2/18/2025
Charlene Tobin	Monetary Donation	$50.00	8/8/2024
Charlotte Hatch	Monetary Donation	$20.00	4/8/2025
Chelsea Rose	Monetary Donation	$25.00	2/12/2025
Cheryl Billings	Monetary Donation	$20.00	2/18/2025
Cheryl Cox	Monetary Donation	$20.50	9/19/2024
Chris Maluso	Monetary Donation	$29.00	4/29/2025
Christina Matheny	Monetary Donation	$100.00	5/4/2025
Christine Liu	Monetary Donation	$4.00	5/30/2025
Christoper Rahn	Monetary Donation	$5.00	10/1/2024

Cindy Dugh	Pet Supplies	$45.00	8/22/2024
Cindy Dughi	Pet Food	$20.00	11/25/2024
Cindy Shegalov	Monetary Donation	$10.00	4/10/2025
Clare Badaracco	Monetary Donation	$10.00	3/17/2025
Claudia Ricarte-Souther	Monetary Donation	$20.00	9/23/2024
Clayton Barnett	Monetary Donation	$5.00	5/29/2025
Colette Devereux	Monetary Donation	$12.00	3/3/2025
Constance Best	Monetary Donation	$13.00	11/23/2024
Corbett Campbell	Monetary Donation	$9.00	2/25/2025
Curiodyssey	3 month pass to CuriOdyssey Science Playground and Zoo, estimated value $85	$85.00	10/15/2024
Dandelion Chocolate	Truffle Making Class for 2, estimated value $200	$200.00	10/15/2024
Danee Asemgar	Monetary Donation	$100.00	3/24/2025
Daniel Gilbert	Monetary Donation	$25.00	11/6/2024
Daniel Woo	Monetary Donation	$5.00	11/6/2024
Darren Cadiz	Monetary Donation	$10.00	7/13/2024
David Angeles Albores	Monetary Donation	$20.00	12/1/2024
David Kiely	Monetary Donation	$1.00	8/14/2024
David Mensah	Monetary Donation	$10.00	8/1/2024
David Rebollini	Monetary Donation	$24.00	3/16/2025
Davin Laskin	Monetary Donation	$5.00	4/1/2025
Dean Prager	Monetary Donation	$27.00	10/2/2024
Debra Goodmansmith	Monetary Donation	$18.00	11/12/2024
Debra Netkin	Pet Food & Pet Supplies	$175.00	4/17/2025
Deirdre Dawson	Monetary Donation	$41.00	12/5/2024
Deirdre Donovan	Pet Food	$35.00	5/11/2025
Denise Roe	Monetary Donation	$1.00	1/12/2025
Derek Remski	Monetary Donation	$7.00	6/15/2025
Derrek Harrison	Monetary Donation	$41.00	8/6/2024
Diana Loeckle	Monetary Donation	$5,000.00	3/19/2025
Diane P. Cragg	Monetary Donation	$100.00	3/10/2025
Dianna Fisk	Monetary Donation	$10.00	11/17/2024
Dolores Miniaci	Monetary Donation	$25.00	1/28/2025
Doug Smith	Monetary Donation	$100.00	2/3/2025

Duke Hoffman	Monetary Donation	$10.00	6/18/2025
Dulce Diaz	Monetary Donation	$5.00	2/9/2025
Earmajell Espero	Monetary Donation	$4.00	1/31/2025
Ed Fischer	Monetary Donation	$10.00	6/14/2025
Edesna Tolentino Becker	Monetary Donation	$10.00	5/2/2025
Edna Henley	Monetary Donation	$50.00	4/21/2025
Edna Henley	Monetary Donation	$50.00	7/1/2024
Eileen Fanelli	Monetary Donation	$30.00	1/10/2025
Elda Sung	Monetary Donation	$9.00	3/18/2025
Eleanor Karlsson	Monetary Donation	$50.00	7/8/2024
Elisha King	Monetary Donation	$5.00	2/20/2025
Eliza Laffin	Monetary Donation	$10.00	2/2/2025
Elizabeth Abbott	Monetary Donation	$10.00	7/3/2024
Elizabeth Kladuson	Monetary Donation	$100.00	8/8/2024
Elizabeth Rocha	Monetary Donation	$0.80	6/24/2025
Emerald Yeh	Monetary Donation	$20.00	5/9/2025
Emilia Patrick	Monetary Donation	$20.00	3/9/2025
Eric Bourhis	Monetary Donation	$20.00	4/9/2025
Eric Ormsby	Monetary Donation	$40.00	11/4/2024
Erick Smith	Monetary Donation	$6.00	11/4/2024
Erin Davies	Monetary Donation	$5.00	7/16/2024
Erin Kunkel	Monetary Donation	$10.00	11/1/2024
Erin Loback	Monetary Donation	$5.00	12/31/2024
Esther Lee	Monetary Donation	$20.00	5/5/2025
Ethan Silvers	Monetary Donation	$10.00	8/21/2024
Evalynna Ho	Monetary Donation	$100.00	1/5/2025
Evelyn Wang	Monetary Donation	$25.00	4/15/2025
Fabiola Cobarrubias	Monetary Donation	$20.00	11/23/2024
Felitia Hancock	Monetary Donation	$25.00	9/3/2024
Felitia Hancock	Monetary Donation	$25.00	6/3/2025
Fernando Sanchez	Monetary Donation	$14.00	5/1/2025
Ford Higgins	Monetary Donation	$5.00	4/18/2025
Francesca Christopher	Monetary Donation	$41.00	1/5/2025
Francisco Hernandez	Monetary Donation	$100.00	6/30/2025
Franklin Peraza	Monetary Donation	$10.00	8/17/2024
Fred Bove	Pet Food & Pet Supplies	$203.98	2/11/2025
Gabriel Murphy	Monetary Donation	$186.00	9/23/2024
Gabriel Murphy	Pet Supplies	$186.00	9/23/2024

Gabrielle Pintoff	Monetary Donation	$6.00	1/1/2025
Gail Arteseros	Monetary Donation	$40.00	8/12/2024
Gail Colombo	Monetary Donation	$112.00	9/14/2024
Gail Glasser	Monetary Donation	$1,000.00	3/4/2025
Galilea Galicia	Monetary Donation	$4.00	5/19/2025
Gary Taniguchi	Monetary Donation	$20.00	3/17/2025
Genesse Rosal	Pet Supplies	$500.00	9/8/2024
Georgia Murphy	Monetary Donation	$75.00	6/21/2025
Georgia Murphy	Monetary Donation	$10.00	1/2/2025
Ginny Brown	Monetary Donation	$5.00	2/4/2025
Glenn Cook	Monetary Donation	$5,000.00	11/25/2024
Grant Martin	Monetary Donation	$100.00	11/28/2024
Greg Richardson	Pet Supplies	$250.00	8/6/2024
Gregory Blum	Pet Food & Pet Supplies	$175.00	9/3/2024
Gregory Broyles	Monetary Donation	$6.00	7/2/2024
Guo Kuang	Monetary Donation	$50.00	9/13/2024
Guy Johnson	Monetary Donation	$100.00	1/22/2025
Guy Johnson	Monetary Donation	$100.00	8/6/2024
Hannah Lewis	Monetary Donation	$24.00	4/9/2025
Harley Cooper	Monetary Donation	$50.00	1/6/2025
Heidi Wilcox	Monetary Donation	$30.00	5/7/2025
Helene Janover	Monetary Donation	$40.00	5/7/2025
Iryna Panasiuk	Monetary Donation	$10.00	8/22/2024
Isabella Mendoza	Pet Food	$290.68	3/7/2025
Iva Martinez-Garcia	Monetary Donation	$50.00	9/17/2024
Jackie Nakano	Monetary Donation	$6.00	9/1/2024
Jacqueline Sharma	Monetary Donation	$50.00	11/1/2024
Jacqueline Whang	Monetary Donation	$24.00	6/5/2025
James Brandes	Monetary Donation	$32.00	9/28/2024
James Cross	Monetary Donation	$5.00	7/16/2024
James Eby	Monetary Donation	$10.00	2/2/2025
James Hattori	Monetary Donation	$20.50	7/1/2024
James Martinez	Monetary Donation	$5.00	12/17/2024
Jami Smith	Monetary Donation	$1.00	10/3/2024
Jan Gregory	Monetary Donation	$25.00	11/10/2024
Jan Hier-King	Monetary Donation	$10.00	4/21/2025

Jana Houweling	Pet Supplies	$35.00	9/15/2024
Jane Werner	Monetary Donation	$39.50	3/1/2025
Janis Naeve	Monetary Donation	$10.00	9/19/2024
Jason Smith	Monetary Donation	$10.00	7/6/2024
Jean Curl	Monetary Donation	$15.50	5/21/2025
Jeane Stetson	Monetary Donation	$25.00	8/5/2024
Jeanette Arpagaus	Monetary Donation	$18.00	12/5/2024
Jeff/Alison Thompson	Monetary Donation	$100.00	10/1/2024
Jen Schwam	Monetary Donation	$10.00	10/1/2024
Jenani Salaver	Monetary Donation	$40.00	12/20/2024
Jennifer Kanenaga	Monetary Donation	$25.00	6/22/2025
Jennifer Marinelly	Monetary Donation	$34.00	11/23/2024
Jennifer Mechem	Monetary Donation	$5.00	12/11/2024
Jennifer Warren	Monetary Donation	$20.00	11/4/2024
Jennifer Warren	Monetary Donation	$25.00	6/14/2025
Jenny Liang	Monetary Donation	$1.00	11/1/2024
Jeremy/Rose Felix	Monetary Donation	$10.00	3/1/2025
Jessica Stevens	Monetary Donation	$15.00	1/15/2025
Jessica Walls	Monetary Donation	$50.00	6/18/2025
Jessie Roth	Monetary Donation	$50.00	6/16/2025
Jillian Gregg	Monetary Donation	$20.00	1/7/2025
Jinyu Weng	Monetary Donation	$1.00	10/18/2024
Joan Sacks415	Monetary Donation	$10.00	3/3/2025
Joanne Min Lin	Monetary Donation	$46.00	8/29/2024
Joanne Otani	Monetary Donation	$50.00	9/2/2024
Jodie Royston	Monetary Donation	$5.50	3/5/2025
Joe Osterbauer	Monetary Donation	$2.00	8/4/2024
John Elia	Monetary Donation	$10.00	6/11/2025
John Pendleton	Monetary Donation	$50.00	11/4/2024
Johnson Hor	Monetary Donation	$39.00	5/9/2025
Jonathan Hoyt	Monetary Donation	$5.00	5/10/2025
Juan Hernandez	Monetary Donation	$0.50	3/22/2025
Judith Reynolds	Monetary Donation	$11.50	9/1/2024
Judy Hernandez	Pet Food	$289.78	2/21/2025
Julia Ingram	Monetary Donation	$100.00	5/16/2025
Julia Ingram	Monetary Donation	$10.00	10/1/2024
Julia Velson	Monetary Donation	$10.00	2/4/2025
Julia Young	Pet Supplies	$80.00	8/14 & 8/16/2024

Julie Goldman	Monetary Donation	$50.00	4/4/2025
Karen Brooks	Monetary Donation	$5.00	10/16/2024
Karen Cooley-Lugerner	Monetary Donation	$50.00	8/20/2024
Karen Schulkin	Monetary Donation	$100.00	9/28/2024
Karolina Zydziak	Monetary Donation	$5.00	8/3/2024
Kate Ringness	Monetary Donation	$41.00	11/9/2024
Katherine Chen	Monetary Donation	$200.00	8/2/2024
Katherine Haar	Monetary Donation	$50.00	2/12/2025
Kathleen Hart	Pet Supplies	$50.00	9/8/2024
Kathleen Mcnutt-Hart	Monetary Donation	$50.00	9/8/2024
Kathleen Rawlins	Pet Supplies	$100.00	3/25/2025
Kathy Bender	Monetary Donation	$25.00	4/22/2025
Kathy Hajopoulos	Monetary Donation	$50.00	8/6/2024
Kay Kirman	Monetary Donation	$5.00	4/1/2025
Kelly Rue	Monetary Donation	$41.00	10/22/2024
Kenneth Lundquist	Monetary Donation	$21.50	2/4/2025
Kimberly Hernandez	Monetary Donation	$10.00	6/12/2025
Kimon Manolius	Pet Supplies, Pet Food, Pet Toys	$75.00	11/27/2024
Konstantinos Katsiapis	Monetary Donation	$5.00	8/10/2024
Kristen Walter	Monetary Donation	$20.00	2/1/2025
Kristin Reinsberg	Monetary Donation	$50.00	4/1/2025
La Vonne Johnson	Monetary Donation	$2.00	4/15/2025
Laelae Chapman	Monetary Donation	$1.00	8/8/2024
Laura Ashley Smith	Monetary Donation	$51.00	4/24/2025
Laura Ducoff	Monetary Donation	$50.00	12/18/2024
Laura Duffy	Monetary Donation	$10.00	3/21/2025
Lauranne Lospalluto	Monetary Donation	$12.00	7/9/2024
Lauren Morales	Monetary Donation	$20.00	9/11/2024
Lexi Blythe	Monetary Donation	$20.00	1/10/2025
Lihui Wu	Monetary Donation	$20.00	11/27/2024
Liisa Sailaranta	Monetary Donation	$30.00	6/24/2025
Lila Steinle	Monetary Donation	$100.00	1/28/2025
Lillian Louie	Monetary Donation	$41.00	10/24/2024
Linda Apeles	Monetary Donation	$50.00	11/21/2024
Linda Jarrell	Monetary Donation	$50.00	6/10/2025
Linda Sanchez	Monetary Donation	$100.00	5/28/2025
Lindsay Ezell	Monetary Donation	$6.00	12/12/2024

Lisa Tsukamoto	Monetary Donation	$41.00	7/3/2024
Liza De Vries	Monetary Donation	$50.00	8/5/2024
Lonnie Walker	Monetary Donation	$5.00	4/3/2025
Lorelle Bacon	Monetary Donation	$10.00	10/20/2024
Loretta Jones	Monetary Donation	$10.00	2/20/2025
Loretta Jones	Monetary Donation	$25.00	11/5/2024
Lori Pryt	Pet Food	$90.00	11/4/2024
Pauline Le	Pet Food	$250.00	4/8/2025
Lorraine Aiken	Monetary Donation	$7.00	4/25/2025
Lucille Power	Monetary Donation	$10.00	11/6/2024
Luis Lamassonne	Pet Supplies, Pet Food, Pet Toys	$100.00	12/10/2024
Luisa Bolanos	Monetary Donation	$20.00	4/2/2025
Lynn Le	Monetary Donation	$4.00	6/5/2025
Lynne Phillips	Pet Supplies, Pet Food, Pet Toys	$650.00	10/22, 10/31/2024
Lynne Phillips	Pet Supplies, Pet Food, Pet Toys	$750.00	3/4/2025
Lynne Phillips	Pet Supplies, Pet Food, Pet Toys	$700.00	1/2/2025
Madeleine Bronstone	Pet Food	$50.00	6/2/2025
Magdalena Campos	Monetary Donation	$15.00	8/18/2024
Maggie Belshaw	Monetary Donation	$10.00	8/1/2024
Manuel Martinez	Monetary Donation	$11.09	10/7/2024
Margaret Brown	Monetary Donation	$35.00	7/10/2024
Maria Cassab	Monetary Donation	$1.00	7/12/2024
Maria Gaggl	Monetary Donation	$20.00	4/7/2025
Maria Guadalupe Lopez	Monetary Donation	$20.00	7/6/2024
Maria Joseph	Monetary Donation	$100.00	11/10/2024
Maria Orozco	Pet Supplies, Pet Food, Pet Toys	$500.00	7/19, 8/20/2024
Mariah Halperin	Monetary Donation	$50.00	8/18/2024
Marianne Forbes	Monetary Donation	$14.00	9/21/2024
Marica Odagaki	Monetary Donation	$20.00	1/7/2025
Mariella Demey	Monetary Donation	$1.00	9/1/2024
Marina Lee	Monetary Donation	$15.00	5/20/2025
Mark Mandel	Monetary Donation	$50.00	2/1/2025

Marshall Honse	Monetary Donation	$6.00	9/24/2024
Martin Fong	Monetary Donation	$5.00	11/19/2024
Mary Ann Hartman	Monetary Donation	$200.00	10/7, 11/14/2024
Mary Burke	Monetary Donation	$10.00	1/12/2025
Mary Kahn	Monetary Donation	$15.50	5/29/2025
Mary Mundy	Monetary Donation	$11.50	9/23/2024
Matt Mcallister	Monetary Donation	$4.00	5/23/2025
Matthew Osowski	Monetary Donation	$50.00	5/10/2025
Matthew Thrasher	Monetary Donation	$11.00	1/23/2025
Megan Demeter	Monetary Donation	$100.00	4/4/2025
Megan Demeter	Monetary Donation	$100.00	10/1/2024
Melina Lenser	Monetary Donation	$50.00	1/20/2025
Melissa Stephens	Monetary Donation	$1.00	9/26/2024
Michael Breslow	Monetary Donation	$25.00	8/5/2024
Michael Hurwitz	Pet Supplies, Pet Food, Pet Toys	$164.08	6/13/2025
Michael Solomita	Monetary Donation	$5.00	4/11/2025
Michael Wonders	Monetary Donation	$3.00	1/8/2025
Michelle Constantine	Monetary Donation	$250.00	5/6/2025
Mikko Shah	Monetary Donation	$30.00	4/4/2025
Minhthi Bui	Monetary Donation	$10.00	11/5/2024
Miranda Putman	Monetary Donation	$25.00	11/16/2024
Mirel Tikkanen	Pet Toys & Pet Supplies	$45.00	4/22/2025
Mirla Reyes	Pet Supplies, Pet Food, Pet Toys	$220.00	12/5/2024
Molly Hale	Monetary Donation	$26.00	11/1/2024
Molly Lemmer	Monetary Donation	$10.00	9/1/2024
Molly Wright	Monetary Donation	$15.00	5/17/2025
Naghmeh Mir	Monetary Donation	$5.00	7/25/2024
Nahyun Kim	Monetary Donation	$1.00	8/2/2024
Nancy Roberts	Monetary Donation	$5.00	8/16/2024
Nancy Taylor	Monetary Donation	$500.00	12/27/2024
Nanette Silverman	Monetary Donation	$10.00	7/10/2024
Natalie Criou	Monetary Donation	$100.00	7/26/2024
Natalie Robbins	Monetary Donation	$105.00	9/15/2024
Natasha Cougoule	Monetary Donation	$100.00	7/3/2024
Neetu Kellison	Monetary Donation	$25.00	1/7/2025
Niklas Lindstrom	Monetary Donation	$20.00	11/12/2024
Niko Kowell	Monetary Donation	$1.00	12/7/2024

Nikolai Komissarov	Monetary Donation	$1.00	8/1/2024
Nina Louie	Monetary Donation	$10.00	11/23/2024
Norma Alvarez	Monetary Donation	$5.00	3/16/2025
Norma Alvarez	Monetary Donation	$5.00	3/16/2025
Oakland Zoo	Zoo passes, including parking, estimated value $115	$115.00	10/15/2024
Oscar Gomez	Monetary Donation	$5.00	10/6/2024
Otoniel Jimenez Iteriano	Monetary Donation	$1.00	9/10/2024
Owen King	Monetary Donation	$5.00	4/29/2025
Patricia Memon	Monetary Donation	$50.00	9/6/2024
Patrick Ward	Monetary Donation	$5.00	10/14/2024
Paulina Espinoza	Pet Supplies	$50.00	8/26/2024
Percy Fisher	Monetary Donation	$5.00	12/8/2024
Peter Fuentes-Afflick	Monetary Donation	$10.00	8/23/2024
Peter Mackey	Monetary Donation	$20.00	11/8/2024
Peter Weltner	Monetary Donation	$50.00	10/1/2024
Lynne Phillips	Pet Food & Pet Supplies	$400.00	4/8/2025
Lynne Phillips	Pet Supplies, Pet Food, Pet Toys	$350.00	4/4/2025
Pop'S Sandwich Shop	10 gift cards for 1 free sandwich, estimated value for each gift card is $10	$100.00	10/15/2024
Priyanta Dharmasena	Monetary Donation	$5.00	5/24/2025
Priyanta Dharmasena	Monetary Donation	$10.00	7/6/2024
Quoc (Chris) Nguyen	Monetary Donation	$10.00	1/25/2025
Rachael Kim Hurka	Monetary Donation	$39.00	2/7/2025
Rachel Nunez Bartel	Monetary Donation	$6.00	10/1/2024
Rahna Brown	Monetary Donation	$25.00	9/10/2024
Randal Smith	Monetary Donation	$25.00	10/28/2024
Randall Museum	Animal Care Tour estimated value $50	$50.00	10/15/2024
Randall Sarafa	Monetary Donation	$50.00	8/1/2024
Randy Thueme	Monetary Donation	$50.00	12/13/2024
Raymond Novak	Monetary Donation	$10.00	10/30/2024
Reed Woodson	Monetary Donation	$10.00	9/25/2024
Reynerio Hernandez	Monetary Donation	$25.00	1/5/2025
Richard Moreno	Monetary Donation	$25.00	9/1/2024
Robert Lustig	Monetary Donation	$10.00	11/18/2024
Robert Matutat	Monetary Donation	$20.00	9/11/2024

Robert Schaezlein	Monetary Donation	$16.00	12/4/2024
Robert Tucker	Monetary Donation	$20.00	11/3/2024
Robin Mccarthy	Monetary Donation	$25.00	6/21/2025
Roger Helbig	Monetary Donation	$10.50	11/29/2024
Roland Andersen	Monetary Donation	$11.00	1/5/2025
Ronald Wright	Monetary Donation	$50.00	6/11/2025
Ropes For Rescue N/A	Pet Supplies	$330.00	7/16, 9/13/2024
Ropes For Rescue N/A	Pet Supplies	$210.00	4/30/2025
Ropes For Rescue N/A	Pet Supplies	$510.00	12/24/2024
Ross Connor	Monetary Donation	$6.00	9/24/2024
Round Table Pizza	5 gift cards, each worth $50	$250.00	10/15/2024
Russell Alegre	Pet Food & Pet Supplies	$25.00	7/29/2024
Ruth Torres Llamas	Monetary Donation	$10.00	11/9/2024
Ryan Blunt	Monetary Donation	$27.50	1/31/2025
Ryan Egan	Monetary Donation	$10.00	2/5/2025
Ryan White	Monetary Donation	$20.00	8/1/2024
Sabrina Larson	Monetary Donation	$15.00	2/16/2025
Sales Force N/A	Pet Toys & Pet Supplies	$100.00	2/8/2025
Sally George	Pet Food & Pet Supplies	$100.00	7/19/2024
Salvatore Curcio	Monetary Donation	$25.00	8/5/2024
Sam Offenberg	Monetary Donation	$18.00	9/1/2024
Samantha Zinober	Monetary Donation	$25.00	1/13/2025
Samuel Fricker	Monetary Donation	$10.00	8/15/2024
San Francisco Zoo	13 Zoo Packs, each contains 3 admission, 3 carousel tickets, and 1 parking pass, estimated value for each pack is $134	$1,742.00	10/15/2024
Sandra Mack	Monetary Donation	$10.00	3/12/2025
Sara O'Hearn	Monetary Donation	$50.00	6/21/2025
Sara Witt	Monetary Donation	$10.00	9/16/2024
Sarah Fisher	Monetary Donation	$9.00	4/4/2025
Sarah Hummingbird	Monetary Donation	$15.00	5/3/2025
Sarah Joost	Monetary Donation	$5.00	2/4/2025
Sarah Larocca	Monetary Donation	$20.00	9/10/2024
Sean Setterfield	Monetary Donation	$5.00	12/4/2024

Seda Perry	Pet Supplies	$50.00	8/25/2024
Shana Combatalade	Monetary Donation	$41.00	8/1/2024
Sharon Heath-Katz	Monetary Donation	$15.50	5/22/2025
Sheelagh Flanagan	Monetary Donation	$9.00	6/25/2025
Sheryl Chamberlain	Monetary Donation	$20.00	5/18/2025
Sheryl Cowan	Monetary Donation	$50.00	7/16/2024
Shuku Yasuda	Pet Food & Pet Supplies	$200.00	11/27/2024
Silvia Sandino	Monetary Donation	$9.00	2/13/2025
Sofie Vanhal	Monetary Donation	$10.00	12/1/2024
Sophia Carlson	Monetary Donation	$10.00	12/7/2024
Stan Hays	Monetary Donation	$5.00	10/3/2024
Stella Clark	Monetary Donation	$60.00	4/15/2025
Stephanie Darling	Monetary Donation	$5.00	5/1/2025
Stephanie Lin	Monetary Donation	$218.00	8/25/2024
Stephanie Lin	Pet Supplies	$218.00	8/25/2024
Stephanie Olfert	Monetary Donation	$25.00	1/7/2025
Stephen Ferrero	Monetary Donation	$10.00	12/21/2024
Steve Roditti	Monetary Donation	$50.00	4/8/2025
Steven Sleczkowski	Monetary Donation	$11.00	12/20/2024
Stuart Kogod	Monetary Donation	$50.00	8/4/2024
Su Lee	Monetary Donation	$10.00	7/1/2024
Suchinda Kosolsuviwat	Monetary Donation	$24.00	10/27/2024
Susan Blank	Monetary Donation	$50.00	8/7/2024
Susan Carp	Monetary Donation	$25.00	12/2/2024
Susan E. Benavente	Monetary Donation	$2.00	2/6/2025
Susan Kulovsky	Monetary Donation	$100.00	8/9/2024
Sylvia Montiel	Monetary Donation	$200.00	10/24/2024
Tamara Greenberg	Pet Supplies	$375.00	2/15/2025
Tanya Koodrin	Pet Supplies	$15.00	9/15/2024
Tatiana Graf	Monetary Donation	$21.00	8/7/2024
Taylar Hart	Monetary Donation	$35.00	9/15/2024
Taylor/Stephen Krotseng/Barstow	Monetary Donation	$6.00	7/10/2024
Terry O'Neill	Monetary Donation	$10.00	8/7/2024
Thomas Yaussy	Monetary Donation	$20.00	6/2/2025

Tiffany Lam	Monetary Donation	$100.00	11/6/2024
Tim Mcmanus	Monetary Donation	$1.00	11/1/2024
Tim Strickland	Monetary Donation	$20.00	6/2/2025
Tina Boetto	Monetary Donation	$10.00	9/1/2024
Tina Machabeli	Monetary Donation	$10.00	8/1/2024
Tonya Poe	Monetary Donation	$100.00	8/24/2024
Tracy Michelmore	Monetary Donation	$10.00	2/22/2025
Tracy Moon	Monetary Donation	$5.00	10/2/2024
Travis Guerre	Monetary Donation	$50.00	10/6/2024
Trent Tai	Monetary Donation	$100.00	2/28/2025
Trinh Dang	Monetary Donation	$20.00	12/4/2024
Udo Hoffman	Monetary Donation	$40.00	7/24/2024
Vicky Berol	Monetary Donation	$600.00	1/3/2025
Victoria Burmeister	Monetary Donation	$10.00	4/11/2025
Virginia Sapiro	Monetary Donation	$40.00	2/8/2025
Welly Chiu	Monetary Donation	$10.00	6/22/2025
Wendy Einhorn	Monetary Donation	$20.00	5/1/2025
Willi Cohen	Monetary Donation	$29.00	3/1/2025
William Anthony Zayas	Pet Toys	$100.00	8/17/2024
William Chiles	Monetary Donation	$100.00	8/2/2024
Winn Mahoney	Monetary Donation	$100.00	5/5/2025
Wolfgang Salger	Monetary Donation	$100.00	12/6/2024
Yamazaki University Of Animal Health Technology	Monetary Donation	$800.00	9/5/2024
Yip Kwan Chan	Monetary Donation	$1.00	5/3/2025
Yolanda Luna	Monetary Donation	$10.00	3/16/2025
Yoshiko Okamura	Monetary Donation	$50.00	10/11/2024
Yumie Ono	Monetary Donation	$50.00	7/24/2024
Yurie Murayama	Monetary Donation	$42.77	10/19/2024
Yvonne Li	Monetary Donation	$10.00	7/5/2024
Yvonne Milham	Pet Food	$28.00	3/26/2025
Yvonne Milham	Monetary Donation	$20.00	1/8/2025
Zach Pumphrey	Monetary Donation	$100.00	7/1/2024
Zena Luu	Pet Supplies	$500.00	8/16/2024
Total		**$38,270.18**	

SF Animal Care and Control also received donations made through the Give2SF Animal Welfare Fund and Animal Shelter Fund (Administrative Code Section 10.100-24). [Give2SF]

Donor's Name	Description	Value	Donation Date
595 Arguello Apts Llc	Monetary donation	$100.00	8/8/2024
Andrew A Ras	Monetary donation	$10.00	3/17/2025
Aspca	Monetary donation	$1,893.00	8/27/2024
Benson Deverett	Monetary donation	$50.00	7/3/2024
Calvin Hao	Monetary Donation	$200.00	1/2/2025
Catherine Stricklin	Monetary Donation	$50.00	12/16/2024
Catherine Stricklin	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/28/2024
Cecile B Michael	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/30/2024
Darcy Mercord	Monetary Donation	$50.00	2/25/2025
Donn J Thompson	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/28/2024
Elizabeth A. Carey	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/5/2024
Erin Cunningham Lindy Mcknight	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/5/2024
Frank Buonagurio	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/27/2024
Gary Mankin	Monetary Donation	$250.00	12/20/2024
Heather Mcnabb	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/8/2024
J. Winn-Bell	Monetary Donation	$30.00	12/12/2024
Jane E Hopkins	Monetary donation	$300.00	10/22/2024
Jesse Juarros	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/21/2024
Kelvin P Lynch	Monetary Donation	$2.44	5/29/2025
Linda M Petrini	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/12/2024
Linda Scourtis	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/30/2024
Mana Ghabussi	Monetary donation	$50.00	6/26/2025
Michael Lee	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/27/2024
Myles Kelley	Monetary donation	$30.00	10/18/2024
Natasha Indi	Monetary Donation	$11.00	2/5/2025
Natasha Indi	Monetary Donation	$11.00	1/27/2025
Natasha Indi	Monetary donation	$5.00	12/2/2024
Natasha Indi	Monetary donation	$5.00	11/25/2024
Natasha Indi	Monetary donation	$5.00	11/18/2024
Natasha Indi	Monetary donation	$11.00	11/7/2024
Natasha Indi	Monetary donation	$11.00	10/30/2024
Natasha Shantinath Indi	Monetary donation	$5.00	3/17/2025
Palmer Family Trust	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/11/2024
Rowena Mah	Monetary Donation	$50.00	1/2/2025
Roxandra Isear	Monetary donation	$36.00	11/20/2024
Run Qin Xie	Monetary donation	$20.00	12/31/2024

Sharon Kaye Heath	Monetary donation	$50.00	6/5/2025
Susannah Owen	Monetary Donation	$20.00	1/2/2025
Thomas Duffy	Monetary Donation	$75.00	12/4/2024
Total		**$4,105.44**	

Separately, Animal Care and Control also received donations from the Friends of SF Animal Care and Control, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit all-volunteer organization founded in 2000, and from volunteers.

Description	Value	Donation Date
Website	$10,105.00	Q1-Q2 7/1/2024-12/31/2024
Rabies & Microchip Clinics	$6,435.00	Q1-Q2 7/1/2024-12/31/2024
Veterinary Care & Supplies	$3,907.00	Q1-Q2 7/1/2024-12/31/2024
Animal Treats	$2,766.72	Q1-Q2 7/1/2024-12/31/2024
Staff & Volunteer Appreciation Events	$2,606.00	Q1-Q2 7/1/2024-12/31/2024
Marketing	$1,245.00	Q1-Q2 7/1/2024-12/31/2024
Husbandry Equipment	$1,190.00	Q1-Q2 7/1/2024-12/31/2024
Staff Training	$356.00	Q1-Q2 7/1/2024-12/31/2024
Position Grants	$179,830.05	Q3-Q4 1/1/2025-6/30/2025
Website	$8,620.00	Q3-Q4 1/1/2025-6/30/2025
Rabies & Microchip Clinics	$8,292.57	Q3-Q4 1/1/2025-6/30/2025
Staff & Volunteer Appreciation Events	$5,730.58	Q3-Q4 1/1/2025-6/30/2025
Veterinary Care & Supplies	$5,111.11	Q3-Q4 1/1/2025-6/30/2025
Husbandry Equipment	$3,371.66	Q3-Q4 1/1/2025-6/30/2025
Animal Treats	$2,766.72	Q3-Q4 1/1/2025-6/30/2025
Kitten Supplies	$2,750.83	Q3-Q4 1/1/2025-6/30/2025
Staff Training	$356.00	Q3-Q4 1/1/2025-6/30/2025
Marketing	$302.37	Q3-Q4 1/1/2025-6/30/2025
Total	**$245,742.61**	

2. **Central Administration- Central Office and Engagement**

Donor's Name	Description	Value	Donation Date
SPUR	3 Tickets to SPUR Award Ceremony	$300.00	5/14/2025
Total		**$300.00**	

3. **Community Challenge Grant (CCG)**

The Community Challenge Grant Program received donations made through the Give2SF Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund (Administrative Code Section 10.100-114).

Donor's Name	Description	Value	Donation Date
Andrew A Ras	Monetary donation	$10.00	3/17/2025
Carl Stein	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/31/2024

Carol Rosenberg Berluti	Monetary Donation	$150.00	12/5/2024
Chinghiu Chan	Monetary donation	$25.00	8/16/2024
Gary Mankin	Monetary Donation	$250.00	12/20/2024
J. Winn-Bell	Monetary Donation	$30.00	12/12/2024
Jesse Juarros	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/21/2024
Joan Lubamersky	Monetary Donation	$5.00	1/6/2025
Joan Lubamersky	Monetary Donation	$5.00	1/2/2025
Myles Kelley	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/18/2024
Palmer Family Trust	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/11/2024
Philip Medlin	Monetary Donation	$5.00	4/15/2025
Roxandra Isear	Monetary donation	$36.00	11/20/2024
Total		**$716.00**	

4. **Convention Facilities**

Donor's Name	Description	Value	Donation Date
SF Travel	1 Event Ticket to 2025 Marketing Conference	$300.00	3/20/2025
Total		$300.00	

5. **Digital and Data Services (DDS)**

Donor's Name	Description	Value	Donation Date
Department Of Technology	4 Conference Tickets to Snowflake Summit	$5,104.00	6/2/2025
Total		**$5,104.00**	

6. **Grants for the Arts (GFTA)**

Grants for the Arts received donations made through the Give2SF Mayor's Voluntary Arts Contribution Fund – Administrative Code Section 10.100-138).

Donor's Name	Description	Value	Donation Date
A B & Kathleen Ciabattoni	Monetary donation	$250.00	11/25/2024
Adrienne Hirt & Jeffrey Rodman	Monetary Donation	$200.00	3/14/2025
Adrienne Torf	Monetary Donation	$25.00	3/31/2025
Al And Susan Arerbach	Monetary donation	$50.00	10/15/2024
Albert And Hsaio-Feng Gaw Fmly T	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/5/2024
Alice B Aronow	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/28/2024
Alice Smith	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/21/2024
Alice Y Lindstrom	Monetary Donation	$10.00	4/7/2025
Allen E Klein	Monetary donation	$25.00	6/5/2025
Andrea Louie	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/21/2024

Andrea Schwartz	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/6/2024
Andrew A Ras	Monetary Donation	$10.00	3/17/2025
Andrew Scoble Maia Krache	Monetary Donation	$25.00	4/9/2025
Ann Macmillan 2009 Trust Macmi	Monetary Donation	$50.00	2/21/2025
Anna Anisimova	Monetary donation	$275.00	11/27/2024
Anna C. Yang	Monetary Donation	$25.00	4/15/2025
Barbara J R Jones	Monetary Donation	$100.00	12/3/2024
Unknown	Monetary Donation	$50.00	11/28/2024
Anna Zara	Monetary donation	$200.00	10/21/2024
Anne Hipshman	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/17/2024
Anne Karin Glass	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/26/2024
Anne M Baele	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/3/2024
Anne R Blackman	Monetary donation	$500.00	11/27/2024
Anne Riley	Monetary Donation	$75.00	3/19/2025
Annie Coull	Monetary Donation	$50.00	1/3/2025
Anthony Grumbach	Monetary Donation	$75.00	4/2/2025
Arkene Waksberg	Monetary donation	$250.00	12/23/2024
Arlene Waksberg	Monetary Donation	$116.65	4/4/2025
Armando Barican	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/5/2024
Arthur J Moeller	Monetary donation	$165.99	12/6/2024
Ayala Mirande	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/4/2024
Aye Aye Yu Revocable Trust Ave	Monetary donation	$20.00	11/6/2024
Barbara Koenig	Monetary donation	$150.00	12/5/2024
Barbara Simkin	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/8/2024
Barbara Slotnik	Monetary Donation	$250.00	4/4/2025
Barbara Slotnik& Steve Kerns	Monetary donation	$250.00	12/4/2024
Barry Chauser	Monetary donation	$50.00	10/31/2024
Benjie A. G. Lasseau	Monetary Donation	$150.00	1/15/2025
Betsy Stransberg	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/4/2024
Betty Dvorson	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/10/2024
Bonnie L Lindahl	Monetary donation	$50.00	10/28/2024
Brandon Jackson	Monetary Donation	$25.00	3/20/2025
Brenda A Miller	Monetary Donation	$100.00	1/2/2025
Brian And Erin Noble	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/5/2024
Bruce And Monalesa Loke	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/12/2024
Bruce Tozier	Monetary Donation	$25.00	4/2/2025
Bruce Tozier	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/4/2024

Cahill Stella L Trust Stella L	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/18/2024
Candace Dekkert	Monetary donation	$259.00	12/4/2024
Carey Harlan	Monetary Donation	$100.00	4/10/2025
Carl Zlatchin	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/21/2024
Carol Donohoe	Monetary Donation	$200.00	3/31/2025
Carol Donohoe	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/19/2024
Carol Lynn Allen	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/27/2024
Carol Rosenberg Berluti	Monetary donation	$300.00	12/5/2024
Catherine Stricklin	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/28/2024
Cathy R. Kornblith	Monetary donation	$500.00	11/13/2024
Charles H. Martin & Lynn M. Strandberg (Trustees Of The Martin Strandberg Fam Trst 08/31/94)	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/19/2024
Charlotte Mcminn	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/11/2024
Chris Zupanovich	Monetary Donation	$25.00	3/6/2025
Christopher H Pederson	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/2/2024
Christopher J Wallis	Monetary Donation	$25.00	3/3/2025
Claire & James Davis	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/25/2024
Claire Bunton	Monetary donation	$500.00	12/3/2024
Clemence J Blondo	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/15/2024
Connie M Buford	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/3/2024
Connie T Van	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/6/2024
Cort Benningfield	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/3/2024
Craig Claussen	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/4/2024
Danise Chandler	Monetary donation	$99.00	10/29/2024
Darrah Kimzey	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/6/2024
Darya Druch	Monetary Donation	$100.00	3/17/2025
Dave Shulman	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/27/2024
David M Lew	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/26/2024
David Pepper	Monetary Donation	$500.00	3/31/2025
David W Hamaker	Monetary Donation	$10.00	4/10/2025
David W Hamaker	Monetary donation	$10.00	12/11/2024
Deborah & Richard Lawn	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/10/2024
Deborah Drysdale	Monetary Donation	$100.00	4/7/2025
Deborah Drysdale	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/5/2024
Dennis Kujawa	Monetary Donation	$20.00	2/20/2025
Dennis Kujawa	Monetary donation	$26.00	12/5/2024
Diana A Glassman	Monetary donation	$300.00	10/18/2024
Diane Lebow	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/11/2024
Diane Tom	Monetary Donation	$50.00	4/3/2025

Diane Zacher	Monetary donation	$10.00	10/16/2024
Domingo Caton	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/26/2024
Don And Marcia Ehrlich	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/3/2024
Don Hayler	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/11/2024
Don L Hayler	Monetary Donation	$99.00	4/8/2025
Don Tokunaga	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/13/2024
Donald Andreini&Steven Crabiel	Monetary donation	$500.00	12/3/2024
Donn J Thompson	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/28/2024
Donna Soohoo	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/11/2024
Dorene Cotter And Anthony Nash	Monetary donation	$500.00	10/31/2024
Doriene Lopez	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/17/2024
Douglas E Gower	Monetary Donation	$20.00	4/10/2025
Douglas Gower	Monetary donation	$20.00	12/10/2024
Duane Steffey	Monetary Donation	$100.00	5/2/2025
Eileen Louie	Monetary Donation	$300.00	1/3/2025
Eileen M Wampole	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/16/2024
Elena Engel	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/27/2024
Elizabeth M. Mcquillan	Monetary Donation	$25.00	1/10/2025
Elizabeth S Cronbach	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/11/2024
Erin Cunningham Lindy Mcknight	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/5/2024
F C Li	Monetary donation	$250.00	12/9/2024
Fidelity Investment	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/6/2024
Filiberto Garcia	Monetary Donation	$50.00	3/13/2025
Filiberto Garcia	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/8/2024
Frances Phillips	Monetary Donation	$50.00	2/19/2025
Frank B Harris	Monetary Donation	$50.00	1/17/2025
Frank Buonagurio	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/27/2024
Franklin Yam Ching	Monetary donation	$15.00	10/15/2024
G.W. Ruth, Hs Ruth	Monetary donation	$250.00	10/28/2024
Gail Bensinger	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/20/2024
Gail Silva	Monetary donation	$75.00	12/3/2024
Gary Mankin	Monetary Donation	$250.00	12/20/2024
Gary Pedler	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/21/2024
Gary Pfitzer	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/3/2024
Gayle Etienne Trustee, Gayle Etienne Trust Dtd 10/11/96	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/28/2024
Georg M Palmer & Cathy Simon	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/10/2024
Georganne Boerger	Monetary Donation	$25.00	3/18/2025

George Macaluso & Craig James	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/3/2024
Gerald Mcgrath	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/25/2024
Gianna Decarl	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/28/2024
Glenna Cole Allee	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/19/2024
Graham Ivell M	Monetary donation	$50.00	10/18/2024
Harold Craig Coffee Jr Poa Samuel Jones Itf Coffee Family Trust	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/13/2024
Hartmut Gerdes	Monetary Donation	$100.00	2/12/2025
Heather Hart	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/3/2024
Heather Mcnabb	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/8/2024
Helen Bogner	Monetary Donation	$100.00	3/21/2025
Helen Bogner	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/22/2024
Helen Dilworth	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/26/2024
Herzstein And Sasaki Trust	Monetary Donation	$25.00	4/9/2025
Hillevi A Null	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/20/2024
Holley Wysong	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/13/2024
Huguette Combs	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/12/2024
Ira Simmons	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/3/2024
Isadore Rosenthal	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/6/2024
J. Winn-Bell	Monetary donation	$30.00	12/12/2024
Jacob Sigg	Monetary donation	$300.00	10/30/2024
Jacopo And Robyn Lenzi (The Lenzi Family Charitable Fund At Schwab Charitable)	Monetary Donation	$50.00	1/8/2025
James Bays	Monetary donation	$500.00	11/27/2024
James K Wong	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/26/2024
James Knoll	Monetary Donation	$100.00	4/9/2025
Jan Yin Lee	Monetary donation	$10.00	11/19/2024
Jane Field	Monetary donation	$16.63	12/3/2024
Jane Shivers	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/29/2024
Janet Woodhams	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/3/2024
Janice Levy	Monetary Donation	$50.00	3/10/2025
Janice Levy	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/31/2024
Janice Ross	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/12/2024
Jayne & Rush Sturges	Monetary donation	$200.00	11/19/2024
Jean Schiffman	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/4/2024
Jeanne Dorward	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/19/2024
Jeanne Milligan	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/3/2024
Jeannette Bonifas	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/12/2024
Jennie Woo	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/3/2024

Jerel Glassman & Beth Mazie	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/3/2024
Jerry Kurtz	Monetary donation	$35.00	11/22/2024
Jesse Juarros	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/21/2024
Jewish Community Foundation Of Los Angeles	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/9/2024
Jill Ellefsen	Monetary donation	$50.00	10/30/2024
Joan Donohue	Monetary donation	$24.76	12/11/2024
Joan Intrator	Monetary Donation	$15.00	4/10/2025
Joan Levin	Monetary Donation	$25.00	4/9/2025
Joan Levin	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/12/2024
John & Ann Carroll	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/6/2024
John & Pamela Sebastian	Monetary Donation	$400.00	3/26/2025
John And Lucile Schoening	Monetary donation	$200.00	11/26/2024
John D Kennedy	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/5/2024
John D Sax	Monetary Donation	$9.41	3/17/2025
John O'Hearn And Debra Asher	Monetary donation	$200.00	11/14/2024
John Sebastian	Monetary Donation	$50.00	2/27/2025
Joshua & Marilyn Zoller Koral	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/5/2024
Joyce M Zanze	Monetary donation	$50.00	10/24/2024
Julie Briden	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/21/2024
Karen & David Crommie	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/22/2024
Karen Larsen	Monetary Donation	$10.00	4/10/2025
Kathleen Velykis	Monetary Donation	$50.00	2/6/2025
Kathryn Kersey	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/9/2024
Keith R Yamamoto	Monetary Donation	$36.18	3/10/2025
Kenneth M. Ashford	Monetary Donation	$74.00	4/17/2025
Kerrilyn A Renshaw	Monetary Donation	$50.00	2/27/2025
Kerrilyn Renshaw	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/19/2024
Lara K Witter	Monetary donation	$250.00	12/4/2024
Lary J Schiller	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/3/2024
Laura Vacco	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/4/2024
Laurence And Pamela Baer	Monetary Donation	$6.00	3/26/2025
Laurence Baer	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/9/2024
Laverne M Reiterman	Monetary donation	$400.00	10/23/2024
Lavonne Jacobsen	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/21/2024
Leslie B. Simon	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/12/2024
Leslie Kirk Campbell	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/3/2024
Linda Gavin	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/5/2024

Linda Scourtis	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/30/2024
Linda Vida	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/17/2024
Lindy Mcknight	Monetary Donation	$25.00	3/14/2025
Lisa Bellm	Monetary donation	$250.00	12/11/2024
Lisa Brinker	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/18/2024
Lisa Garcia	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/21/2024
Lisa Giannetti	Monetary donation	$500.00	10/22/2024
Lise Ostwald	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/10/2024
Loma K Flowers Md	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/13/2024
Lori Harrison	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/24/2024
Lorri Ungaretti	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/2/2024
Louise Fong	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/18/2024
Lynn R Eden	Monetary Donation	$100.00	4/7/2025
M Susan Leseure	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/15/2024
Madelaine Eaton	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/21/2024
Man S Wong	Monetary donation	$20.00	12/10/2024
Marc Loran	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/21/2024
Marcia E Wilson	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/18/2024
Marcia Parrott	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/3/2024
Marcus Theriault	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/25/2024
Margaret B Wheeler	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/26/2024
Margaret Brickner	Monetary donation	$24.94	12/5/2024
Margaret Quine Mcgovern & James A. Mcgovern	Monetary Donation	$50.00	3/19/2025
Margaret Sharp	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/26/2024
Marie R Carluccio	Monetary donation	$85.00	11/26/2024
Marilyn Bair	Monetary donation	$15.00	10/22/2024
Marilyn Levine	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/25/2024
Marilyn Singer	Monetary donation	$50.00	10/29/2024
Mark Leuthold	Monetary Donation	$50.00	3/17/2025
Marsha Bach-Y-Rita	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/28/2024
Martin Vanderlaan	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/22/2024
Mary Ann Zannon Peoples	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/11/2024
Mary Erikson-Ishisaki	Monetary donation	$150.00	10/24/2024
Mary Erikson-Ishisaki	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/22/2024
Mary Lou Ramirez	Monetary Donation	$100.00	3/27/2025
Mary Morris	Monetary Donation	$500.00	1/2/2025
Mary T Negi	Monetary Donation	$100.00	2/27/2025
Mercilee Jenkins	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/27/2024
Merle Easton	Monetary Donation	$1,000.00	1/28/2025
Mesa Construction	Monetary Donation	$15.00	4/10/2025

Mesa Construction	Monetary Donation	$15.00	4/10/2025
Mesa Construction	Monetary donation	$30.00	12/10/2024
Michael Avila	Monetary donation	$20.00	10/21/2024
Michael Palladino	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/13/2024
Michele Young Owyang	Monetary donation	$6.10	12/5/2024
Michelle Brant	Monetary Donation	$25.00	2/3/2025
Michelle Hecht & R Redlinger	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/10/2024
Michiko Conklin	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/26/2024
Mirel Tikkanen	Monetary Donation	$50.00	3/3/2025
Misty Potter	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/10/2024
Monica Ellen Holguin	Monetary donation	$99.00	11/25/2024
Monica Lee	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/6/2024
Mr And Mrs Raymundo R Badua	Monetary Donation	$10.00	4/2/2025
Ms Kathleen N Charlton	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/3/2024
Ms Nicolette Ausschnitt	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/12/2024
Muna Elshaieb	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/12/2024
Myles Kelley & Sh Tay-Kelly	Monetary donation	$30.00	10/17/2024
Nancy B Ream	Monetary donation	$75.00	12/3/2024
Nancy Berry & Elisabeth Beaird	Monetary Donation	$90.00	3/24/2025
Nancy Cohen Mannion	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/4/2024
Nancy Osaki	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/25/2024
Nancy Wiltsek	Monetary Donation	$50.00	3/28/2025
Natividad Copada	Monetary Donation	$50.00	4/7/2025
No Name	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/2/2024
Nora Burnett	Monetary donation	$35.00	11/25/2024
Norita Vlach	Monetary Donation	$100.00	1/22/2025
Norma Randig	Monetary donation	$30.00	11/5/2024
Olivia E Sears	Monetary donation	$500.00	11/5/2024
Olivia Sears	Monetary Donation	$1,000.00	12/5/2024
Palmer Family Trust	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/11/2024
Pamela Sebastian	Monetary donation	$400.00	11/20/2024
Patricia M Mc Guire	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/10/2024
Patty Jaundzems	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/10/2024
Paul Draper	Monetary donation	$300.00	10/29/2024
Paul Draper And Jean Jacobs	Monetary Donation	$200.00	2/3/2025
Paulette Gregg Schulte	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/5/2024
Paulynn Yoshida	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/5/2024

Peppe Llc	Monetary Donation	$100.00	4/7/2025
Peppe Llc	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/5/2024
Peter Herzstein&Sharon Sasaki	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/10/2024
Peter Linenthal	Monetary donation	$50.00	10/17/2024
Peter Nathen Banne	Monetary donation	$10.00	11/19/2024
Peter Straus	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/2/2024
Philip H Frost And Velia K Frost	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/28/2024
Philomena V De Andrade	Monetary donation	$50.00	10/16/2024
Phyllis Scaduto	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/24/2024
Prudence Kohler	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/16/2024
Rasa Gustaitis Moss	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/17/2024
Rebecca Goehring	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/1/2024
Rebecka Wright	Monetary Donation	$500.00	1/2/2025
Renee Renouf Hall	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/4/2024
Rev. Liv Tr Of Sarah Eaton Ballard, Sarah Ballard	Monetary donation	$50.00	10/28/2024
Richard A Levy	Monetary donation	$36.54	12/5/2024
Richard M Dalby Trust	Monetary Donation	$25.00	4/10/2025
Rio M Manzano	Monetary Donation	$25.00	3/6/2025
Robert & Carolyn Karis	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/4/2024
Robert Abra	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/31/2024
Robert Barth	Monetary donation	$250.00	12/3/2024
Robert D. & H. Andrea Nachtigall	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/28/2024
Robert Jacobs	Monetary Donation	$100.00	4/16/2025
Robert Mison	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/9/2024
Robert Popper	Monetary donation	$150.00	12/2/2024
Robert Siegel	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/29/2024
Robert W Davis Carole Seligman	Monetary Donation	$10.00	4/2/2025
Roberta Borgonovo	Monetary donation	$50.00	10/30/2024
Roger Kenneth Stoltzman Tte	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/15/2024
Rolando Castro And Cecile M Ehrmann	Monetary donation	$50.00	10/24/2024
Ron Boring	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/19/2024
Rona Kram	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/31/2024
Ronald D Morrison	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/5/2024
Rose Lewis	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/20/2024
Roseanne Nava	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/18/2024

Ross Siegel	Monetary donation	$50.00	10/28/2024
Roxandra Isear	Monetary donation	$36.00	11/20/2024
Russell Gatewood	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/21/2024
S Page	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/6/2024
Sally J Ross	Monetary Donation	$100.00	2/27/2025
Samuel G Miller	Monetary Donation	$27.25	4/1/2025
Samuel Miller	Monetary donation	$27.25	12/3/2024
Samuel Sobol	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/19/2024
Sandra Auerback	Monetary donation	$150.00	11/25/2024
Sandra J Berger	Monetary Donation	$100.00	3/10/2025
Sandra Phillips	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/16/2024
Sarah Mccuskey	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/13/2024
Schwab Charitale	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/13/2024
Scott R Vandenberg	Monetary Donation	$50.00	3/4/2025
Scott Robinson	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/20/2024
Sharon Silva	Monetary donation	$75.00	12/3/2024
Sherry J Suisman	Monetary Donation	$100.00	4/2/2025
Shoshanah Dobry	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/1/2024
Silvia M C Huang	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/5/2024
Sin Tung Chilio	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/11/2024
Sophia & Janet Constantinou	Monetary Donation	$100.00	3/27/2025
Sophie Constantinou	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/27/2024
Stefanie Arthur	Monetary donation	$70.00	11/8/2024
Stefanie Lively	Monetary donation	$500.00	12/31/2024
Stephanie Brown	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/26/2024
Stephen W Platt	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/16/2024
Steve And Marnie Pinkser	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/18/2024
Steven Raspa	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/4/2024
Susan Abarca	Monetary Donation	$100.00	2/19/2025
Susan J Amdur	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/19/2024
Susan M Wilpitz	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/25/2024
Susan Omura	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/19/2024
Susan Ovington	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/15/2024
Susan Shepard	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/26/2024
Susana Leval	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/16/2024
Susannah Owen	Monetary Donation	$10.00	1/2/2025
Suzanne Oberlin	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/6/2024
Sy Aal	Monetary Donation	$25.00	3/12/2025
Syida C Long Ttee	Monetary donation	$125,000.00	7/3/2024
Syliva P Morafka	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/23/2024

Tatjana Loh	Monetary donation	$300.00	10/30/2024
Terence Oertel	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/30/2024
The Josephine J. Malti Trust (Syida C Long, Trustee)	Monetary Donation	$25,000.00	3/19/2025
Therese Grenchik	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/28/2024
Thomas Angst	Monetary donation	$5.00	6/2/2025
Thomas Duffy	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/4/2024
Thomas J Scally	Monetary Donation	$10.00	4/3/2025
Timothy C Warner	Monetary Donation	$102.52	3/13/2025
Tom Flynn	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/13/2024
Valerie Mountain	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/25/2024
Vibeke Peterson-Jensen	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/27/2024
Vicky Lowe	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/6/2024
Vince Moreci	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/3/2024
Vincent Fausone, Jr	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/1/2024
Virginia Kibre	Monetary donation	$43.84	10/21/2024
Virginia Yee	Monetary donation	$300.00	12/16/2024
Wayne Robins	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/15/2024
William & Elizabeth Reilly	Monetary donation	$200.00	11/6/2024
William A Barnes	Monetary donation	$50.00	11/22/2024
William H. Hall	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/27/2024
William R Thompson, Leslie M Thompson	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/27/2024
Total		**$185,166.06**	

Separately, Grants for the Arts received tickets from grantees and art organizations to monitor City-supported events and conduct City duties.

Donor's Name	Description	Value	Donation Date
Alonzo King Lines Ballet	2 Event Tickets	$228.00	9/27/2024
American Conservatory Theater	2 Event Tickets	$201.00	3/12/2025
Au Co Vietnamese Cultural Center	2 Event Tickets	$60.00	3/16/2025
Bay Area Omni Foundation For The Performing Arts	2 Event Tickets	$150.00	5/3/2025
Beyond Film Festival	2 Event Tickets	$300.00	3/27/2025
Cinema Sf	2 Event Tickets	$30.00	12/12/2024
Circus Bella	2 Event Tickets	$150.00	12/13/2024
Circus Bella	2 Event Tickets	$100.00	12/23/2024
Clarion Perfoming Arts Center	1 Event Ticket	$20.00	5/30/2025
Counterpulse	1 Event Ticket	$35.00	12/12/2024
Crowded Fire Theater Company	2 Event Tickets	$70.00	4/26/2025

Dance Mission Theater	2 Event Tickets	$78.38	10/18/2024
Deborah Slater Dance Theatre	1 Event Ticket	$15.00	2/28/2025
Diasporic Vietnamese Artists Network	1 Event Ticket	$56.00	4/26/2025
Ensemble For These Times	1 Event Ticket	$20.00	5/9/2025
Exploratorium	4 Event Tickets	$120.00	12/22/2024
Fresh Meat Productions	1 Event Ticket	$50.00	6/19/2025
Fresh Meat Productions	2 Event Tickets	$100.00	4/12/2025
Golden Thread Productions	1 Event Ticket	$40.00	4/16/2025
Jewish Film Institute	2 Event Tickets	$40.00	2/22/2025
Melody Of China	2 Event Tickets	$300.00	5/19/2025
Mercury Soul	2 Event Tickets	$250.00	4/25/2025
New Performance Traditions	1 Event Ticket	$39.00	12/5/2024
Noe Valley Chamber Music	2 Event Tickets	$30.00	3/8/2025
ODC	2 Event Tickets	$120.00	12/7/2024
Opera Parallele	2 Event Tickets	$314.00	11/8/2024
Robert Moses' Kin	2 Event Tickets	$90.00	3/16/2025
Russian Center Of San Francisco	2 Event Tickets	$30.00	5/3/2025
San Francisco Bay Area Theatre Company	2 Event Tickets	$60.00	11/9/2024
San Francisco Children's Art Center	1 Event Ticket	$20.00	6/8/2025
San Francisco Independent Film Festival	1 Event Ticket	$20.00	5/29/2025
San Francisco International Arts Festival	2 Event Tickets	$70.00	1/17/2025
San Francisco Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Pride Parade And Celebration Committee	1 Event Ticket	$10.00	6/26/2025
San Francisco Performances	2 Event Tickets	$130.00	1/31/2025
Sf Ballet	2 Event Tickets	$160.00	12/10/2024
Sf City Arts & Lectures	2 Event Tickets	$112.00	3/7/2025
Sf Film	2 Event Tickets	$230.00	10/17/2024
Sf Film	1 Event Ticket	$2,500.00	4/17/2025
Sf Gay Men's Chorus	1 Event Ticket	$77.00	12/6/2024
Sf Heritage	2 Event Tickets	$20.00	1/15/2025
Sf Jazz	2 Event Tickets	$170.00	10/10/2024
Sf Moma	2 Event Tickets	$84.00	11/16/2024
Sf Opera	2 Event Tickets	$246.00	11/19/2024
Sf Opera	2 Event Tickets	$400.00	5/13/2025
Sf Silent Film	2 Event Tickets	$120.00	2/2/2025

Sf Symphony	2 Event Tickets	$300.00	12/11/2024
Sf Travel Association	1 Event Ticket	$300.00	3/20/2025
Smuin Ballet Sf	4 Event Tickets	$160.00	12/18/2024
The Center For Asian American Media	2 Event Tickets	$180.00	5/8/2025
The Queer Chorus Of San Francisco	1 Event Ticket	$20.00	6/13/2025
The Roxie	1 Event Ticket	$60.00	4/23/2025
Young Women's Choral Projects	2 Event Tickets	$50.00	6/8/2025
Zaccho Sf	2 Event Tickets	$80.00	6/20/2025
Total		**$8,615.38**	

7. **Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA)**

Donor's Name	Description	Value	Donation Date
Bienstar Consulting	Stipend paid directly to performers at the 2025 Immigrant Leadership Awards	$200.00	6/9/2025
Amphawa Thai Noodle House	Food and drink donation at the 2025 Immigrant Leadership Awards	$180.55	6/9/2025
St. George	Food and drink donation at the 2025 Immigrant Leadership Awards	$300.00	6/9/2025
Arts.Co.Lab	Stipend paid directly to performers at the 2025 Immigrant Leadership Awards	$400.00	6/9/2025
Total		**$1,080.55**	

8. **Office of Contract Administration (OCA)**

Donor's Name	Description	Value	Donation Date
Sailaja Kurella	Gift of holiday decorations prizes	$150.00	12/19/2024
Total		**$150.00**	

SECTION 2: Gifts received by funds managed by the Office of the City Administrator.

The following funds received gifts between July 1, 2024 and June 30, 2025 (excluding those that are dedicated to specific agency provided in Section 1). Details provided below.

- COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund (Second Supplement to Mayoral Proclamation Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency, dated February 25, 2020)
- Disaster and Emergency Recovery and Response Fund (10.100-100)

The following special funds received no gifts between July 1, 2024 and June 30, 2025.

- City Administrator Convention Facilities Fund (10.100-47)
- Mayor’s Convention Promotion and Services Fund (10.100-97)
- Mayor’s Performing Arts Loan Fund (Section 10.100-119)
- Mayor’s San Francisco Arts Wall of Fame Fund (10.100-125)
- Office of Cannabis Community Reinvestment Fund (10.100-162)

- **COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund**

Donor's Name	Description	Value	Donation Date
Gaalama Nomo	Monetary Donation	$1.00	7/8/2024
Total		**$1.00**	

- **Disaster Recovery and Emergency Response and Recovery Fund**

Donor's Name	Description	Value	Donation Date
Andrew A Ras	Monetary donation	$10.00	3/17/2025
Asuncion J. Rodriguez	Monetary donation	**$30.00**	9/17/2024
Carl Stein	Monetary donation	$50.00	12/31/2024
Carol Rosenberg Berluti	Monetary donation	$100.00	12/5/2024
Donn J Thompson	Monetary donation	$100.00	10/28/2024
Eric Ssnne	Monetary donation	$25.00	12/5/2024
Heather Mcnabb	Monetary donation	$25.00	11/8/2024
J. Winn-Bell	Monetary Donation	$30.00	12/12/2024
Jesse Juarros	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/21/2024
Louise Fong	Monetary donation	$25.00	10/18/2024
Marshall Jones	Monetary Donation	$5.00	5/15/2025
Marshall Jones	Monetary Donation	$5.00	5/15/2025
Myles Kelley	Monetary donation	$50.00	10/18/2024
Roxandra Isear	Monetary donation	$36.00	11/20/2024
Susannah Owen	Monetary Donation	$10.00	1/2/2025
Thomas Kalath	Monetary donation	$100.00	11/6/2024
Wai Tong Daniel Wong	Monetary donation	$80.00	10/21/2024
Total		**$706.00**	

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
Subject:	FW: Annual Report on Gifts (FY25)
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:47:00 AM
Attachments:	Memo_Annual Report on Gifts Received up to 10K_FY25.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department (REC), submitting an Annual Report on Gifts Received up to $10,000, 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: Delmage, Michelle (REC) <michelle.delmage@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 9:27 AM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Ginsburg, Phil (REC) <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>; Guerra, Antonio (REC) <antonio.guerra@sfgov.org>; Bransten, Lisa (REC) <lisa.bransten@sfgov.org>; Mangrobang, Melson (CON) <melson.mangrobang@sfgov.org>; Luo, Kelly (CON) <kelly.luo@sfgov.org>; Zhu, David (CON) <david.zhu@sfgov.org>
Subject: Annual Report on Gifts (FY25)

Hi Angela,

Please see the attached annual report on gifts received by the Recreation and Parks Department in FY 2024-25.

Thanks,

Michelle Delmage
Finance and Accounting Operations Manager
San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department
415-831-6889 (office)

Docusign Envelope ID: D30A302A-63BD-4EF0-91AE-E563B894B3F1

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

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

Date: July 21, 2025

To: Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From: Antonio Guerra
Director of Administration and Finance

Subject: Annual Report on Gifts Received up to $10,000 (Fiscal Year 2024-25)

In accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.100-305, this memo serves to provide the Board of Supervisors with the enclosed Annual Report on Gifts up to $10,000 received by the Department during the past fiscal year.

Please let me know if you have any questions about the information on the report.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
Antonio Manuel Guerra
3AD65566A59C4BC...

Antonio Guerra
Director of Administration and Finance

cc: Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

Enclosure

Docusign Envelope ID: D30A302A-63BD-4EF0-91AE-E563B894B3F1

Donations Report
up to $10,000
July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025

Close Date	Donor Name	Amount	Description	Type
7/10/2024	San Francisco Parks Alliance (SFPA)	$4,000.00	To support maintenance of the fence surrounding the Dahlia Dell Oval Garden.	In-kind
7/31/2024	Benevity Community Impact Fund	$1,892.00	To support volunteer events.	Cash
8/14/2024	SF Irish Famine Memorial Committee	$10,000.00	To support the Irish Famine Memorial in Lincoln Park.	Cash
8/31/2024	Benevity Community Impact Fund	$2,852.50	To support San Francisco parks and open spaces.	Cash
8/31/2024	Benevity Community Impact Fund	$2,121.78	To support volunteer activations in San Francisco parks.	Cash
9/3/2024	Jason Chan	$500.00	To support Rec Center amenities.	In-kind
9/4/2024	Shirley Palega	$99.00	To support Palega Recreation Center.	In-kind
9/4/2024	Ching Hiu Chan	$25.00	To support recreation programming.	Cash
9/20/2024	Alamo Square Neighborhood Association	$999.25	To support new trees in Alamo Square Park.	Cash
9/30/2024	Blue Heron Boathouse	$5,000.00	To support Golden Gate Park operations.	In-kind
10/10/2024	Kunal Patel Foundation	$5,000.00	To support the Tennis & Learning Center program.	Cash
10/18/2024	Mc Kinsey & Co.	$4,808.45	To support volunteer events in Golden Gate Park.	In-kind
10/18/2024	Mc Kinsey & Co.	$3,680.00	To support volunteer events in Golden Gate Park.	Cash
10/24/2024	Isabel Wade	$100.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell in Golden Gate Park.	Cash
10/25/2024	Into the Streets	$9,000.00	To support parks and open spaces.	In-kind
11/1/2024	Hellman & Friedman	$4,696.92	To support volunteer activations.	In-kind
11/1/2024	Hellman & Friedman	$1,472.00	To support volunteer activations.	Cash
11/4/2024	Ching Hiu Chan	$25.00	To support recreation programming.	Cash
11/7/2024	National Philanthropic Trust	$5,000.00	To support volunteer activations in San Francisco parks and open spaces.	Cash
11/7/2024	Myles Kelley	$25.00	To support general operations.	Cash
11/8/2024	Benevity Community Impact Fund	$3,200.00	To support San Francisco parks and open spaces.	Cash
11/8/2024	Jewish Community Federation and Endowment Fund	$250.00	To support park operations.	Cash
11/19/2024	INVNT Group	$7,928.55	To support RPD pools and activities.	In-kind
11/25/2024	Sports Basement	$633.00	To provide support for sports and activity supplies.	Cash
12/5/2024	Carol Rosenberg Berluti	$500.00	To support custodial work at Lake Merced Park.	Cash
12/5/2024	J Winn-Bell	$30.00	To support general operations.	Cash
12/6/2024	Devil's Teeth Baking Company	$4,500.00	To support community events in San Francisco.	In-kind
12/9/2024	John Matthews	$1,500.00	To support Mission Recreation center.	In-kind
12/10/2024	San Francisco Foundation	$5,000.00	To support RPD's general operations.	Cash
12/10/2024	AssetMark Trust Company	$500.00	To support RPD general operations.	Cash
12/11/2024	Nancy Issac	$100.00	To support Golden Gate Park.	Cash
12/11/2024	Roxandra Isear	$36.00	To support RPD operations.	Cash
12/11/2024	Jesse Juarros	$25.00	To support RPD operations.	Cash
12/12/2024	Benevity Community Impact Fund	$534.60	To support volunteering in San Francisco parks and open spaces.	Cash
12/12/2024	Jennifer Herriot-Hatfield	$500.00	To support general operations.	Cash
12/16/2024	Benevity Community Impact Fund	$1,000.00	To support Golden Gate Park operations.	Cash
12/16/2024	Benevity Community Impact Fund	$702.50	To support Golden Gate Park operations.	Cash
12/17/2024	Alexander Sackeim	$200.00	To support Glen Park recreation center.	In-kind
12/19/2024	Classic Amusement	$5,000.00	To support families in need.	In-kind
12/19/2024	James Wendorf	$500.00	To support Golden Gate Park's chain of lakes area.	Cash
12/19/2024	Chip Koch	$400.00	To support recreation center amenities.	In-kind
12/20/2024	Jewish Community Federation and Endowment Fund	$500.00	To support the Ed Lee scholarship fund.	Cash
12/23/2024	Daniel Yansura	$100.00	To support the Golden Gate Park Tree Fern Dell.	Cash
12/23/2024	Schwab Charitable	$50.00	To support RPD operations.	Cash
12/24/2024	Benevity Community Impact Fund	$100.00	To support parks and open spaces.	Cash
12/27/2024	Cathy Cohn	$6,000.00	To support improvements at Strawberry Hill in Golden Gate Park.	Cash

Docusign Envelope ID: D30A302A-63BD-4EF0-91AE-E563B894B3F1

12/30/2024	Linda Scourtis	$50.00	To support general operations.	Cash
12/31/2024	David Slow Cordero	$100.00	To support RPD Programs.	Cash
1/7/2025	Smith Matthew Clive	$50.00	To support general operations.	Cash
1/11/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	$255.00	To support general operations.	Cash
1/13/2025	St. Marys Ping Pong Club	$2,000.00	To support recreation center amenities and activities at St. Mary's Recreation Center.	In-kind
1/16/2025	Vaquero Foundation	$3,000.00	To support general operations.	Cash
1/21/2025	San Francisco Pickleball Community	$1,500.00	To support Rossi Recreation Center amenities and activities.	In-kind
1/23/2025	EY Ernst & Young	$1,000.00	To support volunteer activations in San Francisco Parks.	Cash
1/28/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	$920.00	To support Garfield Pool's swim program.	Cash
2/5/2025	Kevin Rehak	$90.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	In-kind
2/5/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	$25.02	To support general operations.	Cash
2/12/2025	Mirror NYC	$4,500.00	To support Peace Parks programming in District 10.	In-kind
2/12/2025	Dennis Cruz	$90.00	To support the toddler program at Glen Park Recreation Center.	In-kind
2/13/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	$1,000.00	To support general operations.	Cash
2/26/2025	San Francisco Parks Alliance (SFPA)	$3,572.10	To support costs associated with the installation of irrigation and grass. The Friends of Allyne Park generously supported this project.	Cash
3/2/2025	Alice Russell-Shapiro	$250.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
3/3/2025	San Francisco Beautiful	$2,500.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
3/6/2025	Youth Tennis Advantage	$1,500.00	To support sports and athletics at John McLaren Park and Crocker Amazon Park.	In-kind
3/11/2025	San Francisco Chinese Saints Basketball	$1,400.00	To support a display on the history of the San Francisco Chinese Saints Basketball Team at Betty Ann Ong Recreation Center.	In-kind
3/17/2025	Andrew Ras	$10.00	To support RPD general operations.	Cash
3/27/2025	The Presidio Trust	$1,350.00	To support sunset Dunes and the Ocean Beach Dune Revegetation Project.	In-kind
3/29/2025	Glenda Wang	$1,000.00	To support activities at the Golden Gate Park Senior Center.	Cash
4/15/2025	Kaiser Permanente	$10,000.00	To support seasonal events and activities in parks and open spaces.	Cash
4/25/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	$35.00	To support general operations.	Cash
4/28/2025	Civic Joy Fund	$3,479.96	To support volunteer planting events in Golden Gate Park.	In-kind
4/30/2025	Boston Properties	$8,000.00	To support park operations.	In-kind
5/8/2025	Street Level Strategy	$6,991.74	To support volunteer activations in San Francisco parks.	In-kind
5/22/2025	Sharon Westby	$200.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
5/29/2025	Senna Fernando	$10.00	To support general operations.	Cash
6/25/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	$164.97	To support general operations.	Cash

$156,130.34

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: The Department of Elections Mails Ballots and Voter Information Pamphlets for the September 16 Special Recall Election to Registered Voters in District 4
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:48:00 AM
Attachments:	image001.png image003.png

Hello,

Please see below for communication from the Department of Elections, regarding the September 16 Special Recall Election to Registered Voters in District 4.

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: SFVote, (REG) <sfvote@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:30 AM
Subject: The Department of Elections Mails Ballots and Voter Information Pamphlets for the September 16 Special Recall Election to Registered Voters in District 4

Department of Elections
City and County of San Francisco
John Arntz, Director

For Immediate Release
SAN FRANCISCO, Tuesday, August 12, 2025 – This week, the United States Postal Service will begin delivering over 50,000 vote-by-mail ballot packets prepared by the Department of Elections for voters in Supervisorial District 4. Each packet will contain a single-card ballot printed in four languages: English, Chinese, Spanish, and Filipino. Additionally, each packet will include a postage-paid return envelope, voting instructions, and a Voter Information Pamphlet.

“Voters have several convenient options for returning their ballots,” said Director John Arntz. “They can return their ballots via the United States Postal Service, at the Department’s office in City Hall (Room 48), or at one of three official ballot drop boxes

located at the Ortega Branch Library, Parkside Branch Library, and City Hall. Each drop box will be available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, until the polls close on Election Night. My staff is also available to assist voters with any questions they may have."

On Monday, August 18, the Department will launch the Accessible Vote-by-Mail System at sfelections.gov/access. This system enables eligible voters to download and mark their ballot using a screen reader, head-pointer, sip-and-puff device, or other assistive technology. After completing their ballot, voters must print the ballot and return it either by mail or in person.

Voters can track their vote-by-mail ballots from assembly through delivery, signature verification, and counting. To do this, voters can visit the "Track My Ballot" tab at sfelections.gov/voterportal.

Any eligible registrant who does not receive their ballot packet by September 19 is urged to call the Department of Elections at (415) 554-4375, email sfvote@sfgov.org, or navigate to the "Request a Replacement Ballot" tab at sfelections.gov/voterportal to request redelivery. Voters may also request a replacement ballot in person at the Department's office.

The Department of Elections is committed to ensuring that every voter has the tools and support they need to participate confidently in local elections. This includes providing comprehensive information on voting options, accessibility resources, language assistance, and more at sfelections.gov. Voters can also call the Department at (415) 554-4375 to receive election information in their preferred language and format.

###

San Francisco Department of Elections
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 48
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-4375
www.sfelections.gov

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); Entezari, Mehran (BOS)
Subject: FW: DEM Request for Extension of Street Teams Report
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 9:35:00 AM
Attachments: BOS_Extension Request for CSRD Annual Report.pdf
Outlook-cid_image0

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached annual report extension request.

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: Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM) <adrienne.bechelli@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 5:10 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@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>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>
Cc: BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; BOS-Administration <bos-administration@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Modi, Kunal (MYR) <kunal.modi@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Scanlon, Olivia (DEM) <olivia.scanlon@sfgov.org>
Subject: DEM Request for Extension of Street Teams Report

Good afternoon Honorable Members of the Board and Madam Clerk,

Please see attached for a letter requesting an extension for DEM's annual Street Teams Report, which is required by Chapter 20 of the Administrative Code to be submitted in late September.

Due to the recent reorganization of citywide street response teams into the Neighborhood

Street Teams, we are requesting a 60 day extension to ensure we are able to provide sufficient data and analysis of the first 6 months of the NST model to include in the report.

Please feel free to reach out with any questions.

Thank you,
Adrienne

_____

Adrienne Bechelli (she / her)
Deputy Director, Coordinated Street Response
San Francisco Department of Emergency Management
adrienne.bechelli@sfgov.org | 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl, Suite 344

SFDEM
SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Department of Emergency Management
San Francisco City Hall, Room 344
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 558-3800

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Mary Ellen Carroll
Executive Director

August 22, 2025

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

The Honorable Members of the
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors and Clerk Calvillo,

As you know, nine different coordinated street response teams were consolidated into a single neighborhood-based model earlier this year. The Neighborhood Street Teams (NSTs) launched as a pilot on March 25 and then fully expanded on May 12. The new model aims to respond swiftly to emerging issues while working to identify and prevent larger-scale displacement and public safety concerns.

Article XI: Street Teams Reports of Chapter 20 of the Administrative Code (reference File Number 240805 passed on October 29, 2024 by the Rules Committee) states that on the last Friday of September each calendar year, the Department of Emergency Management "shall submit written reports to the Board of Supervisors, with a copy to the Mayor, providing information on the efficiency and effectiveness of the City's street teams" including but not limited to information regarding goals and key initiatives, metrics, milestones and accomplishments, information about street teams' organizational and operational structures, description and details on shelter availability, capacity constraints, data sharing processes, and other information.

Due to the recent reorganization of the street teams and their leadership, we respectfully request a 60-day extension for the submission of our annual report. This will allow DEM to compile a comprehensive 6-month overview of initial operations of the NSTs, gather and analyze relevant data across multiple departments, and incorporate more recent operational changes to the model including but not limited to community safety ambassador deployment.

Please feel free to contact me with any follow up questions. We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Adrienne Bechelli

Adrienne Bechelli
Deputy Director, Coordinated Street Response Division
Department of Emergency Management

Cc: Kunal Modi, Chief of Health, Homelessness, and Family Services, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
Adam Thongsavat, Liaison to the Board of Supervisors, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie

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); Entezari, Mehran (BOS)
Subject:	FW: 2024 Surplus Public Lands Ordinance- No Properties to Report
Date:	Friday, August 15, 2025 11:13:00 AM
Attachments:	2025.7.21_Annual Surplus Property Report from RED to BOS_Final.pdf Surplus Property List 2024.xlsx

Dear Supervisors,

Please see that attached 2024 Surplus Land Ordinance.

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: Po, Vivian (ADM) <vivian.po@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2025 3:08 PM
To: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hayward, Sophie (ADM) <sophie.hayward@sfgov.org>; Penick, Andrico <andrico.penick@sfgov.org>; Giovannelli, Lesley (ADM) <lesley.giovannelli@sfgov.org>; Cukierman, Rachel (ADM) <rachel.cukierman@sfgov.org>
Subject: 2024 Surplus Public Lands Ordinance- No Properties to Report

Madam Clerk,

Please see attached for our department's Real Estate Division's annual update of the City's surplus property list. Please do not hesitate to contact Lesley Giovannelli, Deputy Director of Real Estate, at lesley.giovannelli@sfgov.org, if you have any questions. Thank you very much.

Vivian Po (she/her)
Director of Central Office and Engagement
Office of the City Administrator
City & County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 362

Sign up here to receive the City Administrator's newsletter.

City & County of San Francisco
Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Office of the City Administrator
Carmen Chu, City Administrator

July 21, 2025

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

RE: Surplus Public Lands Ordinance – No Properties to Report for 2024

Madam Clerk,

Pursuant to Section 23 A6(b) of the Administrative Code, the City's surplus property list is transmitted along with this memorandum to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. At my direction, the Real Estate Division surveyed departments with real estate holdings to provide an update to any new surplus properties that could be made available for affordable housing. The Real Estate Division determined that there are no changes to the previously transmitted Surplus Property Report and currently there are no Surplus Properties or Underutilized Properties (not under the jurisdiction of Enterprise Departments or the Educational Districts) available for the development of Affordable Housing.

As a result, per Section 23 A6(c), there is no new information to recommend a hearing of the Board of Supervisors.

Please do not hesitate to contact Lesley Giovannelli, Deputy Director of Real Estate, at lesley.giovannelli@sfgov.org, if we can assist with answering any questions.

Thank you,

Carmen Chu
City Administrator

Property Name	Address	Jurisdicton (Land)	No. of Lots	Land Area(sf)	Bldg Area	Bldg Use	Zoning	District	Vacant	Surplus	Block-Lot	Comments/Status	Adjacent City Parcels?
THERE IS CURRENTLY NO NEW SURPLUS/UNDERUTILIZED PROPERTY SUBJECT TO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SECTION 23A													
BELOW DOES NOT QUALIFY AS SUPRLUS PROPERTY UNDER ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SECTION 23/23A:													
EXCESS PROPERTY	455 BUSH	Public Works	2	949	0		C-3-R	3	TRUE	TRUE	0287-015	Possible encroachment	r/w only
BROADWAY TUNNEL REMAINDER	BROADWAY & LARKIN	Public Works	1	400	0		RH-3	3	TRUE	TRUE	0154-028	Possible encroachment	r/w only
UNDEDICATED ST	SE CARL & ARGUELLO	Public Works	1	1646	0		P	5	TRUE	TRUE	1275A-029	Possible sale to UCSF	r/w only
OLD FIRE STATION 21	1152 OAK STREET	Fire	1	3436		Vacant	NCT	5	FALSE	TRUE	1215-010	Weight equipment/Guardian's use	none
GENEVA AT OCEAN		MOHCD	1	8575	0		RH-2	7	TRUE	TRUE	6946-061	Possible dedication as r/w	r/w only
STATE RELINQUISHMENT	149 Milton St	Public Works	1	80	0		P	8	TRUE	TRUE	6750-054	Possible sale to Caltrans	r/w only
OBSERVATION AREA	191 PORTOLA	Public Works	1	50141	0		P-OS	8	TRUE	TRUE	2848-001	MOHCD reviewed & rejected	840 Clipper
UNDEDICATED STREET	59 Ord Ct	Public Works	1	125	0		RH-2	8	TRUE	TRUE	2619-086	Possible dedication as r/w	r/w only
PLAZA - CLIPPER & 26TH STS	840 CLIPPER	Public Works	1	15868	0		P-OS	8	TRUE	TRUE	2850-023	MOHCD reviewed & rejected	191 Portola
CESAR CHAVEZ ST (REMAINDER)	CESAR CHAVEZ & GUERRERO ST	Public Works	1	701	0		RH-3	8	TRUE	TRUE	6567-009A	Possible sale	r/w only
UNDEDICATED STREET	E OF ROOSEVELT & PARK HILL	Public Works	1	196	0		RH-2	8	TRUE	TRUE	2608-032	Possible encroachment	r/w only
OLD BURNETT AVE (VACATED)	PALO ALTO & GLENBROOK	Public Works	1	7270	0		RH-2	8	TRUE	TRUE	2719B-046	MOHCD reviewed & rejected	SFPUC lot adj
FRANCONIA ST ALIGNMENT	401 FRANCONIA	Public Works	1	2282	0		RH-1	9	TRUE	TRUE	5635-023	Possible dedication as r/w	r/w only
MISSION ST PARCEL	4011 MISSION	Public Works	2	1161	0		RH-2	9	TRUE	TRUE	5835-011A	Possible encroachment	r/w only
PUBLIC WORKS LANDS	691 ALEMANY	Public Works	3	9425	0		RH-1	9	TRUE	TRUE	5886-058	multiple parcels, possible r/w	r/w only
DWIGHT ST PARCEL	859 DWIGHT	Public Works	1	997	0		RH-1	9	TRUE	TRUE	6130-031	Possible encroachment	r/w only
JUSTIN DRIVE	395 JUSTIN DRIVE	MOHCD	1	962	0		RH-1	9	TRUE	TRUE	5842-048	Possible encroachment	r/w only
SOUTHERN FWY (REMAINDER) AT THOMAS	NO ADDRESS	Public Works	1	1546	0		PDR-2	10	TRUE	TRUE	5350-050	Possible sale to Caltrans	r/w only
SOUTHERN FWY (REMAINDER) AT THOMAS	2198 THOMAS AVE	Public Works	1	2047	0		PDR-2	10	TRUE	TRUE	5350-048	Possible sale to Caltrans	r/w only
CESAR CHAVEZ ST CIRCLE	2627 CESAR CHAVEZ	Public Works	1	7278	0		PDR-2	10	TRUE	TRUE	4339-002A	Possible encroachment	DPW yard parking
CESAR CHAVEZ ST RIGHT-OF-WAY	900 CESAR CHAVEZ ST	Public Works	1	2896	0		P	10	TRUE	TRUE	4314-001	Possible encroachment	r/w only
UNDEDICATED STREET	AUGUSTA & CHARTER OAK	Public Works	1	1685	0		P	10	TRUE	TRUE	5376-066		r/w only
CITY-OWNED PARCEL (BAY SHORE BLVD & SILVER)	BAY SHORE BLVD & SILVER AVE	Public Works	1	897	0		NC-1	10	TRUE	TRUE	5402-060	Possible encroachment	r/w only
	1051 PALOU	MOHCD	1	4530	0	Vacant	M-1	10	TRUE	TRUE	4756-046	Possible Sale	r/w only
	114 ELMIRA STREET	MOHCD	1	2040	0		P	10	TRUE	TRUE	5377-068	Possible sale-used as parking	r/w only
GENEVA AVE (REMAINDER AT CAYUGA)	CAYUGA & GENEVA AVENUE	Public Works	---	265	0		RH-1	11	TRUE	TRUE	7029-028	Possible encroachment	r/w only
UNDEDICATED ST (LA GRANDE & MANSFIELD)	LA GRANDE & MANSFIELD	Public Works	1	374	0		RH-1	11	TRUE	TRUE	5963A-001	JT to Rec-Park	surrounded by park
REMAINDER PARCEL	BTWN BART & I-280	Public Works	1	848	0			11	TRUE	TRUE	7176-032	Possible sale to Caltrans	r/w only
REMAINDER PARCEL	UNDER SOUTHBOUND I-280	Public Works	1	4996	0			11	TRUE	TRUE	7126A-007	Possible sale to Caltrans	r/w only
REMAINDER PARCEL	UNDER NORTHBOUND I-280	Public Works	1	287	0			11	TRUE	TRUE	7153-051	Possible sale to Caltrans	r/w only
JUNIPERO SERRA AT SHIELDS		MOHCD	1	2439	0		RH-1	11	TRUE	TRUE	7000-025	Possible encroachment	r/w only
UNDEDICATED ST (DE LONG STREET & SAN DIEGO STREET)	DE LONG STREET & SAN DIEGO ST	Public Works	4	900	0		P		TRUE	TRUE	7174-051	Possible sale to BART	r/w only

Item 25

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: August 2025 monthly update on the status of abortion rights
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 11:57:10 AM
Attachments:	Monthly Memo on the Status of Abortion Rights August 2025.pdf Outlook-iytlfr21.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 August 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, August 27, 2025 11:55 AM
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: Bobba, Naveena (DPH) <naveena.bobba@sfdph.org>; ALARCON, MOLLY (CAT) <Molly.Alarcon@sfcityatty.org>; CLARK, JANA (CAT) <Jana.Clark@sfcityatty.org>; Escandon, Martin (DPH) <martin.escandon@sfdph.org>; Gabillet, Annie (MYR) <annie.gabillet@sfgov.org>; Kim, Phil (HRC) <phil.kim@sfgov.org>; KRELL, REBEKAH (CAT) <Rebekah.Krell@sfcityatty.org>; Lutvak, Charles (MYR) <charles.lutvak@sfgov.org>; Negusse, Nina (MYR) <Nina.Negusse@sfgov.org>; Patil, Sneha (DPH) <sneha.patil@sfdph.org>; WILENSKY, JULIE (CAT) <Julie.Wilensky@sfcityatty.org>; Yip, Angela

(ADM) <angela.yip@sfgov.org>; Yeung, Linda (HRD) <Linda.Yeung@sfgov.org>
Subject: August 2025 monthly update on the status of abortion rights

Good morning all,

On behalf of the Department on the Status of Women, please see the attached Monthly Update on the Status of Abortion Rights Memorandum. I look forward to supporting you around any questions or requests for additional information.

The Department would like to thank Mayor Lurie and his team for yesterday's Women's Equality Day event and for the proclamation for the Department. It was an inspiring and empowering day. We also want to thank City Administrator Chu, Supervisor Chen and Director Iowayna Peña for joining the program.

Have a great rest of your day,

Denise

Denise Heitzenroder (she/her)
Project Manager for Strategic Initiatives
San Francisco Department on the Status of Women
P: 415-252-2576

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: August 27, 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; Interim 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, 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: August 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. 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 current administration has nominated a slate of federal judges with a history of opposing abortion rights, including some that have challenged abortion rights in court. The Trump administration has often made conflicting statements about their stance on abortion, Americans largely support access to abortion care. The administration has avoided calling for outright abortion bans, but Stanford constitutional law professor Bernadette Meyler noted that judicial appointments "are a way of federally shaping the abortion question without going through Congress or making a big, explicit statement." The move could undermine abortion rights across the country without conservatives having to answer for their policies in elections.

- In June, the Hopkins Population Center, State Innovation Exchange, PRB, and the William H. Gates Sr. Institute for Population and Reproductive Health hosted a symposium on the health impacts of abortion bans. The group noted significant negative outcomes for women, ranging from steep increases in rates of sepsis to an increase in infant mortality. Researchers stated "abortion bans have created a public health emergency extending far beyond abortion access." Some key data points include:
    - An increase of over 22,000 more births, with Hispanic, Black, and other racial minorities seeing more than double the increase in fertility rates compared to white women.
    - Infant mortality rates rose 5.6%, with deaths from congenital malformations and birth defects rising nearly 11%.
    - Initial data showed an 8% increase in "pregnancy-associated mortality" with Black women seeing the greatest mortality increase.

- Republican Attorneys General are pressuring Republicans in Congress to introduce measures that would ban shield laws as they attempt to end protections that enable women in their states to access medication abortion. Fifteen Attorneys General sent a letter

to Congress arguing that shield laws interfere with state's rights and violate the Constitution's Extradition and "full faith and credit" clauses.

- More than 15 Democratic Attorneys General and Pennsylvania Governor Josh Shapiro submitted a petition to the Food and Drug Administration arguing that mifepristone should not be limited by the Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies (REMS) classification imposed on it, which requires special certifications and disclosures to dispense the medication. The Attorneys General and Governor assert that mifepristone has been used safely for over 20 years. The drug accounts for 60% of all abortions provided in the U.S.. They also challenged the justification of the provider certification process, noting many providers hesitate to complete the simple process out of fear of being publicly identified. Additionally, the coalition argued that the patient acknowledgement form could cause emotional harm and based on outdated information from 2016.

- Some larger companies have quietly expanded employee benefits to support individuals that may need abortion care, even if they live in a state with restrictions or bans. Companies, including tech giants Google, Apple, Meta and Netflix, enacted these policies stating they wanted to ensure benefits were universal for employees regardless of where they live. As political pressure from conservatives has mounted, fewer executives are willing to be outspoken about abortion bans, and many companies folded the benefits into healthcare packages that include travel stipends for other medical needs. A handful still specify covering abortion care specifically, but many are looking for political cover, especially in states with abortion bans. Texas lawmakers threatened to sue Citigroup for creating a travel costs benefit, and the conservative legal fund, America First Legal, challenged Dick's Sporting Good's stipend. While companies may also want to support employees seeking fertility or gender-affirming care, conservatives are successfully stacking the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), which investigates workplace discrimination and Title VII violations, making many large companies concerned about future challenges, even if they design benefits to include a range of care options.

- Researchers at the University of Illinois showed that targeted regulation of abortion providers, or TRAP laws, have reduced the number of obstetricians and gynecologists (OB-GYNs) in states that

have enacted restrictions. The Supreme Court's 1992 ruling in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* upheld *Roe v. Wade* but created the "undue burden" standard: states could enact regulations regarding abortion access if those regulations did not constitute an "undue burden." The shift left the door open for states to enact regulations, including waiting periods and invasive testing for patients, as well as licensing requirements for providers, before receiving abortion care. Looking at data from 1993-2021, when TRAP laws started to be enacted, researchers found that TRAP laws resulted in a nearly 5% decrease in the number of providers for every 100,000 women of reproductive age (defined as 15-44 in the study.) The loss of providers is even greater in rural areas, which have higher birth rates than urban areas.

- The current administration has announced an end to the Biden-era rules that provided abortion care to veterans in cases of rape or incest. Veterans would be able to access abortion care in the event of a risk to their health but would no longer receive any associated counseling or support. Republicans on the Hill praised the change, while Democrats criticized it as undermining veterans' healthcare.

- Retail giant Costco has confirmed that it will not offer medication abortion through its pharmacies. Costco claims the decision was made in response to low demand for the medication but comes at a time when anti-abortion groups have been pushing pharmacies to stop carrying the medication. Costco has over 500 pharmacies nationwide, in many states that protect access to abortion. The anti-abortion groups are now focused on standalone pharmacy chains like Walgreens and CVS.

- Florida and Texas have filed a request to join the multistate lawsuit against the Food and Drug Administration and Danco Laboratories, the primary manufacturer of abortion medication in the United States. Idaho, Missouri and Kansas joined the lawsuit in 2024, which was led by anti-abortion groups. The groups were found to lack standing to challenge the FDA, but left the door open for the states to move forward with the case. Texas and Florida argued that recent actions in the three initial states have weakened the positions of those states so they must step in to protect their own abortion laws.

- Alaska's politically appointed medical board has proposed regulations that would impact access to abortion and transgender health care. The board's proposal would define providing gender-affirming care to individuals under 18 as "unprofessional conduct"

and said that providing abortion care later in pregnancy is not an "ethical medical practice." Moreover, the conservative board suggested that Alaskans should petition the state legislature to restrict abortion care. Currently abortion remains protected in the state after the state Supreme Court declared that abortion care was protected under the "personal privacy clause of the Alaska Constitution."

- A woman in Colorado is appealing the US District Court for the District of Colorado's ruling upholding the state's buffer zone law and an identical one in Denver. The decision, which was issued at the end of July, stated that the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the measure and that decision has never been overruled. The woman, Wendy Faustin, insists the law interferes with her and other anti-abortion protesters' free-speech rights. Buffer zones laws protecting patients and abortion providers continue to be an area that ant-abortion groups target.

- A case regarding mifepristone from 2017 has made its way to District Court in Hawaii. ACLU Reproductive Freedom Project and a doctor from Kauai allege that the Food and Drug Administration has violated the law by restricting mifepristone without scientific evidence that it is harmful when administered according to instructions. The plaintiffs are asking that the FDA correct its errors rather than seeking an immediate elimination of the current restrictions, which require patients to review counseling forms and providers to receive special certifications.

- In recent weeks the state of Illinois has taken steps to help ensure access to abortion care in the state. Governor Pritzker signed a measure that requires public colleges and universities to provide contraception and abortion medications in student health centers. House Bill 3637 would permit medications that were approved by the Food and Drug Administration prior to 2025 and remain approved by the World Health Organization to still be accessible even if the FDA rescinds approval. It also expands shield laws in the state.

  Separately, a man in McLean County, Illinois, Emerson Evans, was arrested after he stated he snuck his girlfriend abortion medication after she told him she was pregnant. She lost her pregnancy, and Evans faces charges for the intentional homicide of an unborn child.

- A panel of judges in Indiana issued a ruling upholding the state's near total abortion ban. Indiana only permits abortions in cases of

rape or incest, a severe fetal anomaly, or to protect the health of the pregnant person. Plaintiffs argued the ambiguity of the exceptions regarding protecting the health of the mother could deter providers from offering needed care. They also challenged the provisions that required abortions to be performed only in hospitals or ambulatory surgical centers, versus in clinics that provided abortion care before 2022. The panel ruled that the requirements were not a "material burden" and upheld the Indiana Supreme Court's ruling in favor of the state's ban. A separate case challenging the abortion ban on religious grounds is ongoing.

- A federal judge in Maine declined to hear the lawsuit brought by Maine Family Planning that challenged federal efforts to cut all funding to health clinics that provide abortion care. The judge wrote that "Congress is entitled to withhold federal funds and otherwise disassociate from conduct that is not enshrined as a constitutional right, including through incremental measures, and notwithstanding resulting harm to some beneficiaries of its broader Medicaid programming." In a similar case brought by Planned Parenthood in Massachusetts, the federal judge ruled in favor of Planned Parenthood. If the cases are appealed, they would progress to the First Circuit to be reconciled.

- A New York County Clerk that is being sued by Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton has retained counsel in the case, with the support of the local legislature. Clark Taylor Bruck has refused to file a summary judgment against Dr. Margaret Carpenter, who a Texas judge claims is liable for $100,000 in fines and fees for proscribing medication abortion to a woman in Texas. The suit will challenge the strength of shield laws and could set a precedent for future lawsuits challenging those laws.

- In Nevada, Planned Parenthood Mar Monte has filed a lawsuit seeking to suspend the implementation of a parental notification law for minors seeking abortion care. The suit alleges that the 1985 law is "hazy [and] inadequate" and should have been nullified by a 2019 law repealing "informed consent laws for abortions" and the 2022 constitutional amendment ensuring equal rights for all.

  In June, the Republican Governor vetoed a bill that would have allowed abortion providers to remove their names from abortion prescription labels.

- Tennessee Attorney General Herbet H. Slatery III has subpoenaed the abortion records from numerous hospitals in the state regarding

a lawsuit brought in 2023. Tennessee has a near total ban on abortions, only permitting exceptions in some cases of medical emergencies and risks to the mother's life. Multiple women are suing Tennessee arguing their lives were at risk after they were denied emergency abortion care under the state's ban. The American Medical Association and two physicians have also joined the lawsuit, stating they "fear persecution if they provide lifesaving care." The Attorney General has subpoenaed records from Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Heritage Medical Associates, Women's Group of Franklin, among others. The information requested includes the number of abortions performed, policies and guidelines for administering abortions, including any committee decisions and medical diagnosis involved in cases, as well as documents and communications. The subpoena permits hospitals to protect patent privacy "as necessary" but hospitals and providers have pushed back, citing legal concerns and patient confidentiality requirements.

- Republicans in Texas have reintroduced a bill that aims to restrict and penalize the use of abortion medication in the state. The proposed legislation would make anyone that manufactures, mails, delivers, prescribes or distributes abortion pills the target of lawsuits. It also seeks to weaken shield laws and would direct any challenges to the law to federal courts. In a separate case regarding medication abortion and shield laws, the state's former Solicitor General, Jonathan Mitchell, filed a lawsuit on behalf of a woman that says she was dosed with abortion medications by a partner that had been pressuring her to have an abortion. She claims the pills resulted in her having a miscarriage. The case alleges that the former partner, the clinic where he allegedly got the medication and the provider are in violation of Texas' ban and restrictions, as well as the Comstock Act. The plaintiff is seeking "nominal, compensatory, and punitive damages" but the case could have massive implications regarding telehealth, shield laws and abortion medication by mail.

  Meanwhile, Lizelle Gonzalez, who was arrested by authorities in Texas in 2022 for self-administering medication abortion, is suing the local sheriff and prosecutors. In the lawsuit, Gonzalez's attorneys argue the sheriff and prosecutor knew she was not breaking the law, but pursued a case against her anyway. Texas laws target abortion care providers and those that aid individuals seeking abortion, not pregnant people seeking abortion care. Gonzalez was arrested and spent three days in jail before making bail. Previously, the Southern District Court denied Starr County officials' attempts to have the lawsuit dismissed, arguing they had absolute and qualified

immunity. The court ruled the officials violated Gonzalez's "clearly established" rights by pursuing a case against her for an action they knew was not a crime.

- Abortion care access funds in Virginia have seen a substantial increase in requests for support from in-state and out-of-state patients. Virginia currently permits abortions up to 26 weeks, making it the least restrictive state in the region and across the southern U.S.. Representatives from many funds shared that they are experiencing an increase in requests from both in and out-of-state patients but can only support a fraction of patients. For Virginia residents, increased inflation has driven up the costs of abortion care, including meals, travel costs and procedure expenses. Multiple funds noted the increase in patients from Florida, Georgia and North Carolina in particular. One fund, the Blue Ridge Abortion Fund (BRAF), said support to out-of-state patients has increased by 10%, and now accounts for 25% of all funds they disperse.

II. State Policy Update

- Attorney General Bonta has filed a lawsuit against the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in District Court. The suit argues that Trump's "One Big Beautiful Bill Act" is unconstitutionally vague, violates rules requiring notice of major Medicaid funding restrictions, and forces states to violate Planned Parenthood's First Amendment rights by denying reimbursements.

- KQED's *Forum* interviewed UC Davis' School of Law professor Mary Ziegler and Shefali Luthra, a reporter for *The 19th*, about potential threats to abortion rights in California. The interview explores four pending lawsuits and their potential impacts on California and beyond. The conversation reviews long-standing concerns regarding the Comstock Act, as well as the rise in fetal personhood cases.

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 26

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: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for July 2025
Date:	Friday, August 15, 2025 3:32:57 PM
Attachments:	image001.png CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for July 2025.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached Monthly Pooled Investment Report for the month of July 2025, submitted by the Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector.

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: Dion, Ichieh (TTX) <ichieh.dion@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, August 15, 2025 3:31 PM
To: Dion, Ichieh (TTX) <ichieh.dion@sfgov.org>
Subject: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for July 2025

All-

Please find the CCSF Pooled Investment Report for the month of July attached for your use.

Regards,

Ichieh C. Dion
Investment Settlement Operations/Reporting
Investments
Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
Office: 415.554.5433
San Francisco only, **call 311**
sftreasurer.org

Investment Report for the month of July 2025

August 15, 2025

The Honorable Daniel L. Lurie
Mayor of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Franicsco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Colleagues,

In accordance with the provisions of California State Government Code, Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's pooled fund portfolio as of July 31, 2025. These investments provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months and are in compliance with our statement of investment policy and California Code.

This correspondence and its attachments show the investment activity for the month of July 2025 for the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. All pricing and valuation data is obtained from Interactive Data Corporation.

CCSF Pooled Fund Investment Earnings Statistics *

	Current Month		Prior Month	
(in $ million)	Fiscal YTD	July 2025	Fiscal YTD	June 2025
Average Daily Balance	$ 17,222	$ 17,222	$ 17,065	$ 18,549
Net Earnings	55.37	55.37	628.74	57.87
Earned Income Return	3.79%	3.79%	3.69%	3.80%

CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics *

(in $ million) Investment Type	% of Portfolio	Book Value	Market Value	Wtd. Avg. Coupon	Wtd. Avg. YTM	WAM
U.S. Treasuries	22.71%	$ 3,901.8	$ 3,876.1	2.65%	2.99%	748
Federal Agencies	39.29%	6,731.2	6,706.9	3.74%	3.80%	757
Public Time Deposits	0.35%	60.0	60.0	4.32%	4.32%	134
Negotiable CDs	16.82%	2,871.0	2,870.5	4.39%	4.39%	163
Commercial Paper	8.33%	1,422.7	1,422.2	0.00%	4.41%	112
Medium Term Notes	1.11%	189.1	189.2	3.99%	4.23%	551
Money Market Funds	8.07%	1,378.0	1,378.0	4.25%	4.25%	1
Supranationals	1.21%	206.2	206.4	3.71%	3.83%	614
Secured Bank Deposit	2.11%	359.8	359.8	4.35%	4.35%	1
Totals	100.0%	$ 17,119.9	$ 17,069.1	3.35%	3.82%	519

In the remainder of this report, we provide additional information and analytics at the security-level and portfolio-level, as recommended by the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission.

Respectfully,

José Cisneros
Treasurer

cc: Treasury Oversight Committee: Aimee Brown, Kevin Kone, Brenda Kwee McNulty
Greg Wagner - Controller, Office of the Controller
Mark de la Rosa - Director of Audits, Office of the Controller
Mayor's Office of Public Policy and Finance
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
San Francisco Public Library
San Francisco Health Service System

Portfolio Summary
Pooled Fund

As of July 31, 2025

(in $ million) Security Type	Par Value	Book Value	Market Value	Market/Book Price	Current % Allocation	Max. Policy Allocation	Compliant?
U.S. Treasuries	$ 3,912.0	$ 3,901.8	$ 3,876.1	99.34	22.79%	100%	Yes
Federal Agencies	6,735.3	6,731.2	6,706.9	99.64	39.32%	100%	Yes
State & Local Government Agency Obligations	-	-	-	-	0.00%	20%	Yes
Public Time Deposits	60.0	60.0	60.0	100.00	0.35%	100%	Yes
Negotiable CDs	2,871.0	2,871.0	2,870.5	99.98	16.77%	30%	Yes
Bankers Acceptances	-	-	-	-	0.00%	40%	Yes
Commercial Paper	1,442.0	1,422.7	1,422.2	99.97	8.31%	25%	Yes
Medium Term Notes	189.6	189.1	189.2	100.03	1.10%	30%	Yes
Repurchase Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	10%	Yes
Reverse Repurchase/ Securities Lending Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	$75mm	Yes
Money Market Funds - Government	1,378.0	1,378.0	1,378.0	100.00	8.05%	20%	Yes
LAIF	-	-	-	-	0.00%	$50mm	Yes
Supranationals	206.8	206.2	206.4	100.09	1.20%	30%	Yes
Secured Bank Deposit	359.8	359.8	359.8	100.00	2.10%	N/A	Yes
TOTAL	**$ 17,154.6**	**$ 17,119.9**	**$ 17,069.1**	**99.70**	**100.00%**	**-**	**Yes**

The City and County of San Francisco uses the following methodology to determine compliance: Compliance is pre-trade and calculated on a book value basis of the overall portfolio value. Cash balances are included in the City's compliance calculations.

Please note the information in this report does not include cash balances. Due to fluctuations in the market value of the securities held in the Pooled Fund and changes in the City's cash position, the allocation limits may be exceeded on a post-trade compliance basis. In these instances, no compliance violation has occurred, as the policy limits were not exceeded prior to trade execution.
The full Investment Policy can be found at https://sftreasurer.org/banking-investments/investments

Totals may not add due to rounding.

City and County of San Francisco
Pooled Fund Portfolio Statistics

For the month ended July 31, 2025

Average Daily Balance	$17,221,778,795
Net Earnings	$55,367,870
Earned Income Return	3.79%
Weighted Average Maturity	519 days

Investment Type	($ million)	Par Value	Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries		$ 3,912.0	$ 3,901.8	$ 3,876.1
Federal Agencies		6,735.3	6,731.2	6,706.9
Public Time Deposits		60.0	60.0	60.0
Negotiable CDs		2,871.0	2,871.0	2,870.5
Commercial Paper		1,442.0	1,422.7	1,422.2
Medium Term Notes		189.6	189.1	189.2
Money Market Funds		1,378.0	1,378.0	1,378.0
Supranationals		206.8	206.2	206.4
Secured Bank Deposit		359.8	359.8	359.8
Total		**$ 17,154.6**	**$ 17,119.9**	**$ 17,069.1**



Asset Allocation by Market Value

Portfolio Analysis
Pooled Fund





Yield Curves



Source: Bloomberg



	6/30/25	7/31/25	Change
3 Month	4.291	4.337	0.0461
6 Month	4.246	4.268	0.0226
1 Year	3.967	4.092	0.1251
2 Year	3.719	3.957	0.2379
3 Year	3.689	3.900	0.2111
5 Year	3.797	3.972	0.1753

Source: Bloomberg

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

As of July 31, 2025

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	912797QM2	U.S. Treasury Bill	5/6/2025	9/2/2025	0.00	$ 100,000,000	$ 98,614,972	$ 99,627,556	$ 99,617,880
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFK2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/7/2022	9/15/2025	3.50	50,000,000	48,968,750	49,956,791	49,964,845
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	U.S. Treasury Note	5/12/2021	9/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,109,375	49,966,643	49,677,735
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	U.S. Treasury Note	7/26/2021	9/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,281,250	49,971,758	49,677,735
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	U.S. Treasury Note	2/25/2021	10/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,298,828	49,962,664	49,501,955
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	U.S. Treasury Note	3/2/2021	10/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,078,125	49,950,768	49,501,955
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	U.S. Treasury Note	3/4/2021	10/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,048,828	49,949,144	49,501,955
U.S. Treasuries	912797RP4	U.S. Treasury Bill	7/24/2025	11/18/2025	0.00	100,000,000	98,624,925	98,718,947	98,742,070
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	U.S. Treasury Note	2/25/2021	12/31/2025	0.38	50,000,000	49,455,078	49,953,204	49,189,455
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	U.S. Treasury Note	2/26/2021	12/31/2025	0.38	50,000,000	49,271,484	49,937,403	49,189,455
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	U.S. Treasury Note	6/28/2021	4/30/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,662,109	49,947,987	48,722,655
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	U.S. Treasury Note	7/2/2021	4/30/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,730,469	49,958,416	48,722,655
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	U.S. Treasury Note	7/23/2021	5/15/2026	1.63	50,000,000	52,203,125	50,359,873	49,025,390
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	U.S. Treasury Note	8/27/2021	5/15/2026	1.63	50,000,000	51,890,625	50,315,104	49,025,390
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/2/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,931,641	49,987,520	48,521,485
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/14/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,070,313	50,012,922	48,521,485
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/22/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,345,703	50,063,813	48,521,485
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/22/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,328,125	50,060,569	48,521,485
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	8/6/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,406,250	50,075,618	48,521,485
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	8/10/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,240,234	50,044,817	48,521,485
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	9/24/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,937,500	49,988,039	48,521,485
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	10/14/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,593,750	49,921,348	48,521,485
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	1/4/2022	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,027,344	49,802,262	48,521,485
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	U.S. Treasury Note	9/28/2021	8/31/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,449,219	49,879,000	48,214,845
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,689,453	49,927,402	48,171,875
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,671,875	49,923,293	48,171,875
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/19/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,318,359	49,839,681	48,171,875
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/3/2021	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	50,072,266	50,019,266	48,187,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/7/2021	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	50,117,188	50,031,310	48,187,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	3/29/2022	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	47,078,125	49,168,113	48,187,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	U.S. Treasury Note	3/29/2022	12/31/2026	1.25	50,000,000	47,107,422	49,139,550	48,078,125
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	U.S. Treasury Note	4/6/2022	3/31/2027	2.50	25,000,000	24,757,813	24,919,226	24,401,368
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	6/26/2024	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,199,219	50,125,523	50,596,300
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/9/2024	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,292,969	50,186,833	50,596,300
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2024	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,906,250	50,631,601	50,596,300
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/15/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,603,516	50,541,657	50,596,300
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/8/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,667,969	50,645,294	50,596,300
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/9/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,654,297	50,632,981	50,596,300
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/25/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,632,813	50,626,393	50,596,300
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	3/21/2024	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	48,203,125	48,951,322	49,359,375
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	4/3/2024	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	48,113,281	48,886,788	49,359,375
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	9/26/2024	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	49,683,594	49,780,684	49,359,375
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	7/25/2025	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	49,398,438	49,404,410	49,359,375
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLL3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/1/2024	9/15/2027	3.38	50,000,000	49,785,156	49,845,687	49,443,360
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	U.S. Treasury Note	2/12/2025	11/15/2027	4.13	61,000,000	60,692,617	60,744,561	61,264,490
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2024	12/15/2027	4.00	50,000,000	49,718,750	49,777,365	50,114,450
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2024	12/15/2027	4.00	50,000,000	49,712,891	49,772,727	50,114,450
U.S. Treasuries	9128284N7	U.S. Treasury Note	4/9/2024	5/15/2028	2.88	65,000,000	61,082,227	62,335,809	63,263,285
U.S. Treasuries	91282CND9	U.S. Treasury Note	5/15/2025	5/15/2028	3.75	70,000,000	69,485,938	69,522,522	69,740,237
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/5/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,974,609	49,983,507	50,156,250

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/18/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,927,734	49,952,683	50,156,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/18/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,904,297	49,937,337	50,156,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	2/6/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,677,734	49,786,494	50,156,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	2/27/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,298,828	49,529,308	50,156,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	48,939,453	49,252,206	50,156,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	U.S. Treasury Note	12/12/2023	8/31/2028	4.38	50,000,000	50,115,234	50,075,263	50,683,595
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/14/2025	8/31/2028	4.38	50,000,000	50,550,781	50,514,672	50,683,595
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2025	1/31/2029	4.00	60,000,000	59,927,344	59,931,621	60,175,782
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2024	1/31/2029	4.00	65,000,000	65,266,602	65,216,360	65,190,431
U.S. Treasuries	9128286B1	U.S. Treasury Note	4/11/2024	2/15/2029	2.63	50,000,000	45,710,938	46,866,151	47,904,295
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	U.S. Treasury Note	4/8/2024	2/28/2029	4.25	50,000,000	49,773,438	49,834,294	50,568,360
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2025	2/28/2029	4.25	75,000,000	75,568,359	75,535,577	75,852,540
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2024	4/30/2029	4.63	50,000,000	51,171,875	50,972,180	51,224,610
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	U.S. Treasury Note	12/20/2024	4/30/2029	4.63	51,000,000	51,448,242	51,385,173	52,249,102
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKT7	U.S. Treasury Note	10/23/2024	5/31/2029	4.50	50,000,000	51,039,063	50,864,752	51,023,440
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/1/2024	7/31/2029	4.00	50,000,000	51,046,875	50,866,461	50,138,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2024	7/31/2029	4.00	50,000,000	49,888,672	49,906,640	50,138,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/7/2024	7/31/2029	4.00	65,000,000	65,563,672	65,468,123	65,180,050
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	U.S. Treasury Note	10/1/2024	8/31/2029	3.13	50,000,000	49,041,016	49,203,429	48,519,530
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	U.S. Treasury Note	10/3/2024	8/31/2029	3.13	65,000,000	63,664,453	63,889,403	63,075,389
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFT3	U.S. Treasury Note	5/30/2025	10/31/2029	4.00	60,000,000	59,988,281	59,988,738	60,157,032
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLR0	U.S. Treasury Note	11/25/2024	10/31/2029	4.13	50,000,000	49,611,328	49,665,065	50,371,095
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	U.S. Treasury Note	4/10/2025	2/28/2030	4.00	50,000,000	49,927,734	49,932,309	50,132,815
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	U.S. Treasury Note	5/22/2025	4/30/2030	3.88	50,000,000	49,468,750	49,489,658	49,845,705
Subtotals					**2.65**	**$ 3,912,000,000**	**$ 3,887,708,882**	**$ 3,901,839,569**	**$ 3,876,130,695**
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/18/2023	8/18/2025	4.00	25,000,000	24,982,000	24,999,628	24,989,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/18/2023	8/18/2025	4.00	26,500,000	26,483,835	26,499,666	26,488,340
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/18/2023	8/18/2025	4.00	30,000,000	29,981,700	29,999,622	29,986,800
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	Fannie Mae	3/4/2021	8/25/2025	0.38	25,000,000	24,684,250	24,995,365	24,932,500
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	Fannie Mae	2/25/2021	8/25/2025	0.38	72,500,000	71,862,000	72,490,675	72,304,250
Federal Agencies	3130A8ZQ9	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/2/2021	9/12/2025	1.75	10,295,000	10,575,333	10,303,350	10,260,203
Federal Agencies	3133EPVY8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/15/2023	9/15/2025	5.00	8,230,000	8,224,074	8,229,635	8,232,551
Federal Agencies	3133EPVY8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/15/2023	9/15/2025	5.00	15,000,000	14,981,850	14,998,883	15,004,650
Federal Agencies	3133EPVY8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/15/2023	9/15/2025	5.00	20,000,000	19,975,800	19,998,510	20,006,200
Federal Agencies	3137EAEX3	Freddie Mac	3/4/2021	9/23/2025	0.38	22,600,000	22,295,352	22,590,297	22,475,248
Federal Agencies	3133EPDL6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/15/2023	10/1/2025	4.85	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,016,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2025	5.13	24,000,000	23,923,440	23,991,621	24,028,080
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2025	5.13	25,000,000	24,985,500	24,998,413	25,029,250
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2025	5.13	35,000,000	34,972,350	34,996,974	35,040,950
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2025	5.13	50,000,000	49,972,000	49,996,936	50,058,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2021	11/17/2025	1.05	39,675,000	39,622,232	39,671,099	39,268,728
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2021	11/17/2025	1.05	55,000,000	54,923,000	54,994,308	54,436,800
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/16/2021	12/16/2025	1.17	45,000,000	44,954,100	44,995,696	44,450,550
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/16/2021	12/16/2025	1.17	50,000,000	49,949,000	49,995,218	49,389,500
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/29/2022	12/29/2025	4.00	15,000,000	14,954,700	14,993,800	14,973,750
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/29/2022	12/29/2025	4.00	20,000,000	19,939,600	19,991,734	19,965,000
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/29/2022	12/29/2025	4.00	25,000,000	24,923,750	24,989,564	24,956,250
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/13/2023	1/13/2026	4.00	20,000,000	19,982,400	19,997,350	19,960,400
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/13/2023	1/13/2026	4.00	30,000,000	29,977,200	29,996,568	29,940,600
Federal Agencies	3130AUTC8	Federal Home Loan Bank	2/9/2023	2/6/2026	4.01	21,100,000	20,985,427	21,080,188	21,059,277

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/17/2023	2/17/2026	3.63	25,000,000	24,928,500	24,985,799	24,889,250
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/17/2023	2/17/2026	3.63	30,000,000	29,905,500	29,981,231	29,867,100
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	2/23/2026	4.38	25,000,000	24,953,500	24,991,260	24,999,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	2/23/2026	4.38	28,000,000	27,954,080	27,991,369	27,999,720
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	2/23/2026	4.38	50,000,000	49,918,000	49,984,588	49,999,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ35	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/25/2022	2/25/2026	3.32	35,000,000	34,957,650	34,993,118	34,807,850
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/2/2023	3/13/2026	4.88	10,000,000	9,953,900	9,988,020	10,035,400
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/2/2023	3/13/2026	4.88	10,000,000	9,950,700	9,987,189	10,035,400
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/2/2023	3/13/2026	4.88	10,000,000	9,950,700	9,987,189	10,035,400
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/5/2024	3/13/2026	4.88	25,000,000	25,053,750	25,017,030	25,088,500
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/2/2024	3/13/2026	4.88	36,730,000	36,803,460	36,753,176	36,860,024
Federal Agencies	3133EP5K7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/2/2024	3/13/2026	4.50	50,000,000	49,758,000	49,923,651	50,053,000
Federal Agencies	3133EMZ21	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/9/2021	4/6/2026	0.69	15,500,000	15,458,150	15,493,898	15,120,715
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/8/2022	4/8/2026	2.64	20,000,000	19,961,200	19,993,361	19,767,200
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/8/2022	4/8/2026	2.64	30,000,000	29,941,800	29,990,041	29,650,800
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/10/2023	6/12/2026	3.75	17,045,000	16,991,479	17,030,067	16,982,956
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/17/2023	6/12/2026	3.75	20,000,000	19,939,200	19,982,930	19,927,200
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/1/2023	6/12/2026	4.00	10,000,000	9,934,300	9,981,305	9,982,000
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/1/2023	6/12/2026	4.00	15,000,000	14,899,350	14,971,360	14,973,000
Federal Agencies	3130AWLZ1	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/10/2023	6/12/2026	4.75	50,000,000	49,856,000	49,957,528	50,221,000
Federal Agencies	3130B1BT3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/18/2024	6/12/2026	4.88	13,485,000	13,505,093	13,493,742	13,542,581
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/18/2024	6/12/2026	4.88	20,000,000	20,030,400	20,013,227	20,109,600
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/18/2024	6/12/2026	4.88	32,000,000	32,051,200	32,022,276	32,175,360
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	4.25	20,000,000	19,969,200	19,991,064	19,986,400
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	4.25	24,700,000	24,640,226	24,682,657	24,683,204
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	4.25	30,000,000	29,951,400	29,985,899	29,979,600
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026	4.38	25,000,000	24,986,750	24,996,059	25,034,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026	4.38	25,000,000	24,986,750	24,996,059	25,034,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026	4.38	50,000,000	49,973,500	49,992,118	50,069,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026	4.75	10,000,000	9,991,700	9,997,263	10,039,800
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026	4.75	19,000,000	18,984,800	18,994,987	19,075,620
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026	4.75	21,000,000	20,982,780	20,994,321	21,083,580
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,250,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,250,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,250,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,250,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,227,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,227,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,227,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,227,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	3,000,000	2,991,930	2,997,082	3,024,030
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	9,615,000	9,589,136	9,605,649	9,692,016
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	16,000,000	15,956,960	15,984,439	16,128,160
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	25,000,000	24,936,750	24,977,132	25,200,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,193,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,193,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,193,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,193,250
Federal Agencies	3133EPSW6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/14/2023	8/14/2026	4.50	50,000,000	49,885,000	49,960,338	50,168,500
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,151,000
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,151,000

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,151,000
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,151,000
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	19,000,000	18,974,730	18,986,016	18,891,510
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	25,000,000	24,966,750	24,981,600	24,857,250
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	25,900,000	25,865,553	25,880,937	25,752,111
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	50,000,000	49,933,500	49,963,199	49,714,500
Federal Agencies	3133EM4X7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/12/2023	9/10/2026	0.80	28,975,000	26,174,277	27,844,100	27,890,466
Federal Agencies	3130AXCP1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/18/2023	9/11/2026	4.88	11,895,000	11,821,965	11,867,000	11,980,882
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	15,000,000	14,996,850	14,998,122	14,986,950
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	25,000,000	24,994,750	24,996,870	24,978,250
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	25,000,000	24,994,750	24,996,870	24,978,250
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	50,000,000	49,989,500	49,993,740	49,956,500
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,166,000
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,166,000
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,166,000
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,166,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2026	4.88	14,000,000	13,904,940	13,961,404	14,098,140
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2026	4.88	30,000,000	29,834,100	29,932,641	30,210,300
Federal Agencies	3133ETJS7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/29/2025	11/10/2026	4.00	12,600,000	12,581,352	12,583,604	12,562,200
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,172,750
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,172,750
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,172,750
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,172,750
Federal Agencies	3130AXU63	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/17/2023	11/17/2026	4.63	50,000,000	49,911,500	49,961,806	50,325,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,142,750
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,142,750
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,142,750
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,142,750
Federal Agencies	3133ERWR8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/8/2024	1/7/2027	3.50	12,500,000	12,373,750	12,419,421	12,371,375
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	12,000,000	11,973,000	11,986,725	12,014,760
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	25,000,000	24,943,750	24,972,343	25,030,750
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	29,350,000	29,283,963	29,317,531	29,386,101
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	50,000,000	49,887,500	49,944,686	50,061,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	5,000,000	4,992,850	4,996,464	4,992,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	10,000,000	9,986,600	9,993,373	9,984,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	25,000,000	24,968,500	24,984,422	24,960,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	35,000,000	34,955,900	34,978,191	34,944,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	50,000,000	49,933,000	49,966,867	49,920,000
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/18/2025	2/18/2027	4.25	2,000,000	1,997,860	1,998,341	2,000,500
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/18/2025	2/18/2027	4.25	25,000,000	24,974,250	24,980,035	25,006,250
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/18/2025	2/18/2027	4.25	30,000,000	29,967,600	29,974,879	30,007,500
Federal Agencies	3133ERD24	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/18/2024	2/18/2027	4.25	30,000,000	29,983,500	29,988,639	30,007,500
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/23/2025	2/23/2027	4.00	10,000,000	9,993,800	9,994,477	9,968,300
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/23/2025	2/23/2027	4.00	45,000,000	44,972,100	44,975,147	44,857,350
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,286,000
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,286,000
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,286,000
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,286,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/16/2022	3/10/2027	1.68	48,573,000	47,432,020	48,205,630	46,683,996
Federal Agencies	3133EP6K6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/2/2024	3/26/2027	4.50	50,000,000	49,910,000	49,950,202	50,301,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	22,500,000	22,392,338	22,463,896	21,921,750

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	24,500,000	24,377,010	24,458,756	23,870,350
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	25,000,000	24,804,000	24,934,273	24,357,500
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	17,000,000	16,955,120	16,974,706	17,199,070
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	20,000,000	19,947,200	19,970,243	20,234,200
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	40,000,000	39,894,400	39,940,485	40,468,400
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	48,000,000	47,873,280	47,928,582	48,562,080
Federal Agencies	3133ERDS7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/13/2024	5/6/2027	4.75	12,727,000	12,740,236	12,734,822	12,872,342
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	4,650,000	4,646,792	4,648,722	4,645,304
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	5,000,000	4,996,550	4,998,626	4,994,950
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	21,000,000	20,987,001	20,994,823	20,978,790
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	25,000,000	24,982,750	24,993,129	24,974,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2023	5/20/2027	4.00	31,000,000	30,905,760	30,950,348	30,902,660
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2023	5/20/2027	4.00	58,850,000	58,662,269	58,751,091	58,665,211
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	10,000,000	9,986,700	9,987,604	9,979,000
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	13,000,000	12,982,710	12,983,885	12,972,700
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	16,500,000	16,478,055	16,479,546	16,465,350
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	20,000,000	19,973,400	19,975,208	19,958,000
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	36,000,000	35,952,120	35,955,374	35,924,400
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/19/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	10,000,000	10,141,500	10,053,735	9,881,800
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/19/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	12,375,000	12,552,829	12,442,531	12,228,728
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/20/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	21,725,000	22,016,550	21,835,779	21,468,211
Federal Agencies	3130AX4E5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/13/2024	6/11/2027	4.50	11,000,000	10,937,190	10,962,057	11,092,741
Federal Agencies	3130B1EF0	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/10/2024	6/11/2027	4.63	20,700,000	20,795,634	20,760,915	20,920,455
Federal Agencies	3133EPMV4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2027	4.13	28,940,000	28,911,928	28,926,877	28,913,954
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2022	6/28/2027	3.24	27,865,000	28,099,066	27,954,659	27,395,753
Federal Agencies	3133ERJZ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/28/2024	6/28/2027	4.50	30,000,000	29,985,840	29,991,000	30,180,300
Federal Agencies	3133ERVR9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/30/2024	7/1/2027	3.50	55,000,000	54,925,200	54,947,923	54,331,750
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2024	7/8/2027	4.50	25,000,000	25,033,250	25,021,457	25,154,750
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/10/2024	7/8/2027	4.50	25,000,000	25,025,500	25,016,471	25,154,750
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/23/2024	7/23/2027	4.25	10,000,000	9,996,500	9,997,695	10,017,700
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/23/2024	7/23/2027	4.25	15,000,000	14,994,750	14,996,543	15,026,550
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	8/23/2027	4.13	10,000,000	9,974,000	9,988,093	9,995,400
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/15/2024	10/15/2027	3.88	5,000,000	4,997,250	4,997,978	4,973,300
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/15/2024	10/15/2027	3.88	8,000,000	7,996,160	7,997,177	7,957,280
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/4/2025	11/3/2027	4.25	5,000,000	4,999,350	4,999,465	5,013,000
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/4/2025	11/3/2027	4.25	41,880,000	41,877,738	41,878,140	41,988,888
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/15/2023	11/15/2027	4.63	27,950,000	27,834,008	27,883,628	28,253,258
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/15/2023	11/15/2027	4.63	33,300,000	33,161,472	33,220,733	33,661,305
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	21,000,000	20,936,790	20,949,978	21,006,300
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	25,505,000	25,428,485	25,444,449	25,512,652
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	33,000,000	32,893,080	32,915,388	33,009,900
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	38,343,000	38,227,588	38,251,667	38,354,503
Federal Agencies	3133ERT84	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/14/2025	1/14/2028	4.25	29,750,000	29,575,963	29,607,591	29,853,233
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/31/2025	1/28/2028	4.25	47,000,000	46,976,030	46,980,025	47,172,960
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/31/2025	1/28/2028	4.25	50,000,000	49,974,500	49,978,750	50,184,000
Federal Agencies	3136GAAR0	Fannie Mae	2/14/2025	2/7/2028	4.69	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,972,000
Federal Agencies	3136GAAR0	Fannie Mae	2/14/2025	2/7/2028	4.69	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,972,000
Federal Agencies	3136GAAR0	Fannie Mae	2/14/2025	2/7/2028	4.69	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,972,000
Federal Agencies	3136GAAR0	Fannie Mae	2/14/2025	2/7/2028	4.69	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,972,000
Federal Agencies	3136GAAR0	Fannie Mae	2/14/2025	2/7/2028	4.69	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,944,000
Federal Agencies	3133EP5S0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2024	3/20/2028	4.25	4,971,000	4,916,667	4,934,728	4,992,773

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/11/2025	6/5/2028	3.88	7,370,000	7,342,584	7,343,866	7,348,037
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/5/2025	6/5/2028	3.88	25,000,000	24,957,250	24,959,473	24,925,500
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/7/2028	4.50	14,934,000	14,962,076	14,954,268	15,168,314
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/7/2024	6/7/2028	4.50	15,000,000	14,994,600	14,996,152	15,235,350
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/7/2028	4.50	20,000,000	20,037,600	20,027,144	20,313,800
Federal Agencies	3130AWC24	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/14/2025	6/9/2028	4.00	10,000,000	9,996,600	9,996,839	10,022,790
Federal Agencies	3130B6MU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/10/2025	6/15/2028	4.59	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,973,250
Federal Agencies	3130B6MU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/10/2025	6/15/2028	4.59	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,973,250
Federal Agencies	3130B6MU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/10/2025	6/15/2028	4.59	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,973,250
Federal Agencies	3130B6MU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/10/2025	6/15/2028	4.59	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,946,500
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2025	7/3/2028	3.75	22,500,000	22,424,175	22,425,911	22,404,375
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	7/3/2028	3.75	25,000,000	24,904,000	24,906,112	24,893,750
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2025	7/3/2028	3.75	50,000,000	49,829,500	49,833,403	49,787,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPSK2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/7/2023	8/7/2028	4.25	19,500,000	19,412,250	19,447,071	19,620,510
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	10,000,000	9,979,100	9,987,153	10,133,100
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	15,000,000	14,962,800	14,977,134	15,199,650
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	25,000,000	24,943,500	24,965,271	25,332,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	33,000,000	32,904,960	32,941,582	33,439,230
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/20/2024	10/20/2028	4.25	5,000,000	4,972,100	4,979,273	5,030,100
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/20/2024	10/20/2028	4.25	38,000,000	37,785,300	37,840,501	38,228,760
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/13/2023	11/13/2028	4.63	12,000,000	11,984,040	11,989,517	12,207,600
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/13/2023	11/13/2028	4.63	20,000,000	19,971,600	19,981,346	20,346,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/13/2023	11/13/2028	4.63	55,000,000	54,922,285	54,948,956	55,951,500
Federal Agencies	3130B3GD9	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/28/2024	11/27/2028	4.00	47,025,000	46,940,355	46,956,080	47,059,799
Federal Agencies	3130AVBD3	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/9/2024	3/9/2029	4.50	25,000,000	25,018,750	25,013,747	25,426,000
Federal Agencies	3133EP5U5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/8/2024	3/20/2029	4.13	51,660,000	51,008,309	51,181,420	51,903,319
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/8/2024	4/30/2029	4.75	27,892,000	28,191,755	28,117,558	28,527,659
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/8/2024	4/30/2029	4.75	30,000,000	30,317,400	30,238,836	30,683,700
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/8/2024	4/30/2029	4.75	63,085,000	63,763,795	63,595,776	64,522,707
Federal Agencies	3130B1BC0	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/31/2025	6/8/2029	4.63	9,705,000	9,943,355	9,943,186	9,931,922
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	10,000,000	9,967,600	9,974,774	10,091,300
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	10,000,000	9,967,600	9,974,774	10,091,300
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	10,000,000	9,967,600	9,974,774	10,091,300
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	20,000,000	19,935,200	19,949,548	20,182,600
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	29,000,000	28,923,730	28,940,618	29,264,770
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/2/2024	7/2/2029	4.01	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,602,000
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/2/2024	7/2/2029	4.01	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,602,000
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/2/2024	7/2/2029	4.01	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	63,965,200
Federal Agencies	3133ERKX8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/12/2024	7/12/2029	4.25	20,000,000	19,989,200	19,991,477	20,103,400
Federal Agencies	3130B2KJ3	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/4/2024	9/4/2029	4.63	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,835,250
Federal Agencies	3130B2KJ3	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/4/2024	9/4/2029	4.63	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,835,250
Federal Agencies	3130B2KJ3	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/4/2024	9/4/2029	4.63	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,670,500
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/27/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	15,000,000	15,392,700	15,325,986	15,085,260
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/29/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	15,000,000	15,048,300	15,040,815	15,085,260
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/29/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	15,000,000	15,043,200	15,036,505	15,085,260
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/29/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	25,590,000	25,663,699	25,652,278	25,735,454
Federal Agencies	3130B2TG0	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/24/2024	9/24/2029	4.38	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,736,250
Federal Agencies	3130B2TG0	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/24/2024	9/24/2029	4.38	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,736,250
Federal Agencies	3130B2TG0	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/24/2024	9/24/2029	4.38	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	64,314,250
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/9/2025	10/9/2029	4.00	10,000,000	9,987,500	9,987,919	10,008,900
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/9/2025	10/9/2029	4.00	15,000,000	14,981,250	14,981,878	15,013,350

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3136GAFL8	Fannie Mae	4/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.71	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,957,750
Federal Agencies	3136GAFL8	Fannie Mae	4/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.71	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,957,750
Federal Agencies	3136GAFL8	Fannie Mae	4/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.71	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,957,750
Federal Agencies	3136GAFL8	Fannie Mae	4/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.71	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,957,750
Federal Agencies	3136GAFL8	Fannie Mae	4/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.71	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,915,500
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/30/2025	11/30/2029	4.00	15,000,000	14,945,400	14,947,491	14,977,800
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/30/2025	11/30/2029	4.00	23,000,000	22,922,030	22,925,016	22,965,960
Federal Agencies	3136GA3N7	Fannie Mae	12/27/2024	12/27/2029	5.05	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	19,976,400
Federal Agencies	3136GA3N7	Fannie Mae	12/27/2024	12/27/2029	5.05	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	19,976,400
Federal Agencies	3136GA3N7	Fannie Mae	12/27/2024	12/27/2029	5.05	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	19,976,400
Federal Agencies	3136GA3N7	Fannie Mae	12/27/2024	12/27/2029	5.05	62,000,000	62,000,000	62,000,000	61,926,840
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/25/2025	1/18/2030	4.50	12,815,000	13,022,219	13,007,030	12,988,771
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/25/2025	1/18/2030	4.50	18,000,000	18,289,620	18,268,392	18,244,080
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	1/23/2030	4.00	5,000,000	4,989,550	4,989,793	4,993,750
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	1/23/2030	4.00	14,450,000	14,418,788	14,419,515	14,431,938
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	1/23/2030	4.00	25,000,000	24,946,000	24,947,257	24,968,750
Federal Agencies	3133ER7L9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/10/2025	3/18/2030	4.00	8,695,000	8,671,610	8,673,076	8,630,483
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	15,000,000	14,993,700	14,994,095	14,956,050
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	32,260,000	32,243,870	32,244,881	32,165,478
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/10/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	43,020,000	42,904,276	42,911,473	42,893,951
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	46,750,000	46,732,703	46,733,787	46,613,023
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/15/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	50,000,000	49,527,500	49,555,662	49,853,500
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	9,750,000	9,746,100	9,746,150	9,729,720
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/10/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	10,000,000	9,974,000	9,974,740	9,979,200
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	15,000,000	14,998,650	14,998,667	14,968,800
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/10/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	20,000,000	19,945,000	19,946,566	19,958,400
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	25,000,000	24,965,000	24,965,753	24,948,000
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/9/2025	6/14/2030	4.13	12,515,000	12,579,452	12,578,629	12,570,617
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/23/2025	6/14/2030	4.13	16,000,000	16,063,200	16,061,843	16,071,104
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	10,070,000	10,077,855	10,077,750	10,059,608
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	15,000,000	15,012,900	15,012,728	14,984,520
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	16,944,000	16,937,222	16,937,309	16,926,514
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	41,000,000	41,035,260	41,034,791	40,957,688
Federal Agencies	3133ETPF8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/14/2025	7/8/2030	3.75	20,000,000	19,776,200	19,778,413	19,775,600
Subtotals					**3.74**	**$ 6,735,329,000**	**$ 6,724,846,374**	**$ 6,731,208,092**	**$ 6,706,949,952**
Public Time Deposits	PPGQE6C86	Five Star Bank	5/21/2025	11/17/2025	4.29	$ 20,000,000	$ 20,000,000	$ 20,000,000	$ 20,000,000
Public Time Deposits	PPGUALS16	Bank of San Francisco	6/11/2025	12/8/2025	4.31	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Public Time Deposits	PPGQEWEX2	Bridge Bank NA	6/16/2025	12/15/2025	4.34	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Public Time Deposits	PPGZ308Q4	Bank of San Francisco	7/7/2025	1/5/2026	4.33	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Public Time Deposits	PPGUCT9Z3	Bridge Bank NA	7/14/2025	1/12/2026	4.33	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Subtotals					**4.32**	**$ 60,000,000**	**$ 60,000,000**	**$ 60,000,000**	**$ 60,000,000**
Negotiable CDs	06367DMU6	Bank of Montreal/CHI	11/15/2024	8/11/2025	4.59	$ 65,000,000	$ 65,000,000	$ 65,000,000	$ 65,001,950
Negotiable CDs	78015JC47	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	1/6/2025	8/11/2025	4.41	66,000,000	66,000,000	66,000,000	65,999,340
Negotiable CDs	89115DWB8	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/21/2025	9/5/2025	4.36	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,994,500
Negotiable CDs	78015J2Y2	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	11/15/2024	9/8/2025	4.55	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,002,600
Negotiable CDs	89115DWF9	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/21/2025	9/10/2025	4.36	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,993,500
Negotiable CDs	06367DN92	Bank of Montreal/CHI	12/4/2024	9/22/2025	4.53	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,001,500
Negotiable CDs	13606DCV2	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	12/4/2024	9/22/2025	4.53	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,003,000
Negotiable CDs	13606DFF4	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	2/5/2025	9/24/2025	4.42	110,000,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	109,992,300
Negotiable CDs	06367DMX0	Bank of Montreal/CHI	11/19/2024	10/24/2025	4.57	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,003,500

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Negotiable CDs	06367DPW9	Bank of Montreal/CHI	3/21/2025	10/24/2025	4.35	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,986,000
Negotiable CDs	13606DCE0	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	11/20/2024	10/24/2025	4.55	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,001,500
Negotiable CDs	89115DPK6	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	2/7/2025	10/24/2025	4.49	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,996,000
Negotiable CDs	89115DWK8	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/21/2025	11/5/2025	4.35	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,983,500
Negotiable CDs	78015J3U9	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	11/20/2024	11/19/2025	4.56	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,011,500
Negotiable CDs	78015J3L9	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	11/20/2024	11/20/2025	4.51	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,005,400
Negotiable CDs	96130AZR2	Westpac Banking Corp/NY	4/14/2025	12/3/2025	4.35	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,957,000
Negotiable CDs	13606DHE5	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	3/31/2025	12/15/2025	4.34	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	74,964,000
Negotiable CDs	89115DXB7	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/31/2025	12/15/2025	4.34	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	59,976,600
Negotiable CDs	89115DXF8	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/31/2025	12/29/2025	4.34	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	64,972,050
Negotiable CDs	06367DQK4	Bank of Montreal/CHI	5/7/2025	1/12/2026	4.32	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,973,000
Negotiable CDs	89115DQT6	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	2/13/2025	1/12/2026	4.54	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,031,000
Negotiable CDs	13606DKH4	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	5/6/2025	1/20/2026	4.33	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	59,982,000
Negotiable CDs	13606DGY2	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	3/25/2025	1/22/2026	4.36	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	59,979,600
Negotiable CDs	13606DGZ9	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	3/25/2025	1/28/2026	4.36	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	79,976,000
Negotiable CDs	89115DWT9	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/25/2025	1/28/2026	4.36	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,975,500
Negotiable CDs	06367DQ32	Bank of Montreal/CHI	3/31/2025	2/9/2026	4.33	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	74,982,000
Negotiable CDs	13606DHF2	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	3/31/2025	2/9/2026	4.33	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,981,500
Negotiable CDs	06367DQP3	Bank of Montreal/CHI	5/14/2025	2/11/2026	4.43	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	69,977,811
Negotiable CDs	78015JG84	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	5/16/2025	2/23/2026	4.33	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	59,994,600
Negotiable CDs	78015JGQ4	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	5/29/2025	3/6/2026	4.38	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,012,500
Negotiable CDs	89115DEG7	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	5/29/2025	3/11/2026	4.41	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,012,500
Negotiable CDs	78015JJ81	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	6/25/2025	3/16/2026	4.29	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,968,000
Negotiable CDs	89115DHC3	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	6/20/2025	3/16/2026	4.40	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,018,000
Negotiable CDs	96130AA24	Westpac Banking Corp/NY	5/20/2025	3/16/2026	4.35	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,971,000
Negotiable CDs	96130AA65	Westpac Banking Corp/NY	5/28/2025	3/23/2026	4.38	140,000,000	140,000,000	140,000,000	139,962,200
Negotiable CDs	06367DRH0	Bank of Montreal/CHI	6/25/2025	3/24/2026	4.33	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,978,500
Negotiable CDs	06367DRJ6	Bank of Montreal/CHI	6/25/2025	3/25/2026	4.33	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,979,000
Negotiable CDs	78015JJQ1	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	7/9/2025	4/7/2026	4.33	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,002,000
Negotiable CDs	96130AZZ4	Westpac Banking Corp/NY	5/15/2025	5/4/2026	4.35	125,000,000	125,000,000	125,000,000	124,952,500
Negotiable CDs	96130AC22	Westpac Banking Corp/NY	6/20/2025	6/15/2026	4.32	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,979,000
Negotiable CDs	06418NHV7	Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU	7/24/2025	7/1/2026	4.27	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,963,000
Subtotals					**4.39**	**$ 2,871,000,000**	**$ 2,871,000,000**	**$ 2,871,000,000**	**$ 2,870,496,951**
Commercial Paper	62479LV51	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/1/2025	8/5/2025	0.00	$ 25,000,000	$ 24,622,875	$ 24,988,028	$ 24,981,925
Commercial Paper	62479LV51	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	5/6/2025	8/5/2025	0.00	110,000,000	108,776,556	109,946,222	109,920,470
Commercial Paper	14912DVE6	Caterpillar Financial Svcs	7/29/2025	8/14/2025	0.00	80,000,000	79,846,044	79,874,911	79,855,920
Commercial Paper	89233GVR4	Toyota Motor Credit	12/2/2024	8/25/2025	0.00	65,000,000	62,867,567	64,807,600	64,795,575
Commercial Paper	89233GW85	Toyota Motor Credit	12/17/2024	9/8/2025	0.00	65,000,000	62,918,646	64,701,542	64,685,140
Commercial Paper	03785DWF9	Apple	4/28/2025	9/15/2025	0.00	10,000,000	9,836,667	9,947,500	9,943,750
Commercial Paper	62479LWF8	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/1/2025	9/15/2025	0.00	20,000,000	19,604,767	19,893,500	19,885,840
Commercial Paper	62479LWP6	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/1/2025	9/23/2025	0.00	35,000,000	34,275,208	34,780,492	34,764,765
Commercial Paper	62479LX67	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/1/2025	10/6/2025	0.00	25,000,000	24,445,139	24,805,208	24,792,025
Commercial Paper	89233GX84	Toyota Motor Credit	1/27/2025	10/8/2025	0.00	60,000,000	58,179,667	59,512,667	59,490,960
Commercial Paper	62479LXF7	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/1/2025	10/15/2025	0.00	11,000,000	10,744,776	10,902,833	10,896,699

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Commercial Paper	62479LXL4	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/1/2025	10/20/2025	0.00	15,000,000	14,643,133	14,858,667	14,850,240
Commercial Paper	62479LXN0	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/1/2025	10/22/2025	0.00	55,000,000	53,678,533	54,468,822	54,437,900
Commercial Paper	89233GXP6	Toyota Motor Credit	2/12/2025	10/23/2025	0.00	75,000,000	72,665,021	74,233,979	74,226,450
Commercial Paper	89233GXQ4	Toyota Motor Credit	1/29/2025	10/24/2025	0.00	50,000,000	48,388,278	49,494,833	49,478,200
Commercial Paper	62479LY33	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/28/2025	11/3/2025	0.00	10,000,000	9,772,150	9,886,678	9,883,520
Commercial Paper	62479LY74	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/28/2025	11/7/2025	0.00	11,000,000	10,744,650	10,870,341	10,866,603
Commercial Paper	62479LYH2	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/28/2025	11/17/2025	0.00	38,000,000	37,076,463	37,508,660	37,493,726
Commercial Paper	62479LYM1	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/28/2025	11/21/2025	0.00	26,000,000	25,355,655	25,651,369	25,641,174
Commercial Paper	62479LYS8	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/28/2025	11/26/2025	0.00	15,000,000	14,620,167	14,790,375	14,784,045
Commercial Paper	89233GZ17	Toyota Motor Credit	3/24/2025	12/1/2025	0.00	125,000,000	121,333,750	123,225,069	123,146,625
Commercial Paper	89116EZ55	Toronto Dominion Bank	5/7/2025	12/5/2025	0.00	11,000,000	10,724,694	10,836,375	10,831,359
Commercial Paper	89116EZF3	Toronto Dominion Bank	5/7/2025	12/15/2025	0.00	25,000,000	24,346,333	24,599,556	24,587,275
Commercial Paper	89233GZF6	Toyota Motor Credit	3/25/2025	12/15/2025	0.00	75,000,000	72,692,292	73,815,667	73,767,750
Commercial Paper	89116EZP1	Toronto Dominion Bank	5/7/2025	12/23/2025	0.00	40,000,000	38,924,111	39,326,400	39,302,000
Commercial Paper	62479MB69	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	5/13/2025	2/6/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,198,604	24,436,938	24,432,075
Commercial Paper	62479MC92	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	6/18/2025	3/9/2026	0.00	130,000,000	125,891,133	126,575,944	126,574,760
Commercial Paper	62479MCQ4	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	7/7/2025	3/24/2026	0.00	100,000,000	96,930,556	97,225,694	97,190,000
Commercial Paper	62479MD67	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	7/28/2025	4/6/2026	0.00	110,000,000	106,712,100	106,764,289	106,742,350
Subtotals					**0.00**	**$ 1,442,000,000**	**$ 1,404,815,534**	**$ 1,422,730,158**	**$ 1,422,249,121**
Medium Term Notes	594918BJ2	Microsoft	9/26/2024	11/3/2025	3.13	$ 11,749,000	$ 11,650,191	$ 11,725,953	$ 11,707,526
Medium Term Notes	91324PFF4	United Health	7/25/2024	7/15/2026	4.75	15,000,000	14,974,800	14,987,820	15,042,900
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	Microsoft	7/9/2024	9/15/2026	3.40	6,452,000	6,270,957	6,358,983	6,403,545
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	Microsoft	7/9/2024	9/15/2026	3.40	13,009,000	12,645,919	12,822,455	12,911,302
Medium Term Notes	14913UAN0	Caterpillar	9/18/2024	10/16/2026	4.45	18,385,000	18,600,288	18,510,254	18,433,169
Medium Term Notes	89236TMY8	Toyota Motors	1/9/2025	1/8/2027	4.60	40,000,000	39,978,000	39,984,156	40,182,000
Medium Term Notes	037833CJ7	Apple	9/18/2024	2/9/2027	3.35	50,000,000	49,586,000	49,736,158	49,432,500
Medium Term Notes	24422EXV6	John Deere	9/6/2024	7/15/2027	4.20	10,000,000	9,998,600	9,999,042	10,009,800
Medium Term Notes	24422EYD5	John Deere	6/5/2025	6/5/2028	4.25	25,000,000	24,977,750	24,978,907	25,028,500
Subtotals					**0.55**	**$ 189,595,000**	**$ 188,682,505**	**$ 189,103,727**	**$ 189,151,243**
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	7/31/2025	8/1/2025	4.21	$ 14,369,625	$ 14,369,625	$ 14,369,625	$ 14,369,625
Money Market Funds	31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	7/31/2025	8/1/2025	4.26	889,192,291	889,192,291	889,192,291	889,192,291
Money Market Funds	608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fı	7/31/2025	8/1/2025	4.25	407,722,486	407,722,486	407,722,486	407,722,486
Money Market Funds	262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Manageme	7/31/2025	8/1/2025	4.18	14,948,556	14,948,556	14,948,556	14,948,556
Money Market Funds	85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MM	7/31/2025	8/1/2025	4.21	33,285,922	33,285,922	33,285,922	33,285,922
Money Market Funds	61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity F	7/31/2025	8/1/2025	4.23	18,527,572	18,527,572	18,527,572	18,527,572
Subtotals					**4.25**	**$ 1,378,046,452**	**$ 1,378,046,452**	**$ 1,378,046,452**	**$ 1,378,046,452**
Supranational	45950VRU2	International Finance Corp	1/26/2023	1/26/2026	4.02	$ 100,000,000	$ 100,000,000	$ 100,000,000	$ 99,699,000
Supranational	45818WDG8	Inter-American Development Bank	8/25/2021	2/27/2026	0.82	19,500,000	19,556,907	19,507,256	19,128,915
Supranational	459058KJ1	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	7/17/2024	6/15/2027	3.13	12,323,000	11,934,333	12,073,273	12,128,297
Supranational	4581X0EN4	Inter-American Development Bank	4/9/2024	2/15/2029	4.13	25,000,000	24,630,000	24,729,961	25,135,000
Supranational	4581X0EN4	Inter-American Development Bank	7/17/2024	2/15/2029	4.13	50,000,000	49,827,000	49,866,271	50,270,000
Subtotals					**3.71**	**$ 206,823,000**	**$ 205,948,240**	**$ 206,176,761**	**$ 206,361,212**
Secured Bank Deposit	0660P0999	Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acc	7/31/2025	8/1/2025	4.35	$ 359,756,956	$ 359,756,956	$ 359,756,956	$ 359,756,956
Subtotals					**4.35**	**$ 359,756,956**	**$ 359,756,956**	**$ 359,756,956**	**$ 359,756,956**
Grand Totals					**3.35**	**$ 17,154,550,408**	**$ 17,080,804,942**	**$ 17,119,861,714**	**$ 17,069,142,581**

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

For month ended July 31, 2025

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	T 0.375 12/31/2025	$ 50,000,000	15,795	9,544		$ 25,339
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	T 0.250 10/31/2025	50,000,000	10,530	12,719		23,249
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	T 0.375 12/31/2025	50,000,000	15,795	12,767		28,561
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	T 0.250 10/31/2025	50,000,000	10,530	16,771		27,301
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	T 0.250 10/31/2025	50,000,000	10,530	17,325		27,854
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	T 0.250 09/30/2025	50,000,000	10,587	17,234		27,822
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	T 0.750 04/30/2026	50,000,000	31,590	5,928		37,518
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	T 0.750 04/30/2026	50,000,000	31,590	4,739		36,329
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	1,162		38,016
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	(1,203)		35,652
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	(5,941)		30,914
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	(5,639)		31,216
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	50,000,000	68,444	(38,871)		29,573
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	T 0.250 09/30/2025	50,000,000	10,587	14,592		25,179
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	T 0.250 07/31/2025		10,359	11,147		21,506
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	(7,040)		29,815
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	T 0.250 07/31/2025		10,359	13,128		23,487
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	(4,172)		32,682
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	50,000,000	68,444	(34,036)		34,409
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	1,114		37,968
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	T 0.750 08/31/2026	50,000,000	31,590	9,496		41,086
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	37,056	5,295		42,351
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	37,056	5,595		42,651
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	7,322		44,177
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	37,056	11,694		48,750
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	52,937	(1,229)		51,708
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	52,937	(1,997)		50,940
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	18,408		55,263
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	T 1.250 12/31/2026	50,000,000	52,649	51,594		104,243
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	52,937	53,063		106,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	T 2.500 03/31/2027	25,000,000	52,937	4,125		57,062
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFK2	T 3.500 09/15/2025	50,000,000	147,418	29,766		177,185
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	T 4.375 08/31/2028	50,000,000	184,273	(2,072)		182,201
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	168,478	481		168,959
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	168,478	1,379		169,857
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	168,478	1,826		170,304
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	168,478	6,221		174,699
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	168,478	13,714		182,192
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	136,889	46,575		183,463
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	136,889	49,441		186,329
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	T 4.250 02/28/2029	50,000,000	179,008	3,930		182,938
U.S. Treasuries	9128284N7	T 2.875 05/15/2028	65,000,000	157,422	81,130		238,551
U.S. Treasuries	9128286B1	T 2.625 02/15/2029	50,000,000	112,396	75,077		187,473
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	168,478	21,787		190,266
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	195,867	(5,697)		190,170
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	195,867	(8,480)		187,388
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	136,889	9,740		146,629
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	T 3.125 08/31/2029	50,000,000	131,624	16,562		148,185

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	50,000,000	171,181	(18,397)		152,783
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLL3	T 3.375 09/15/2027	50,000,000	142,154	6,173		148,326
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	T 3.125 08/31/2029	65,000,000	171,111	23,091		194,202
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	65,000,000	222,535	(9,940)		212,595
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	T 4.000 01/31/2029	65,000,000	222,535	(5,244)		217,291
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	195,867	(28,667)		167,200
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKT7	T 4.500 05/31/2029	50,000,000	190,574	(19,162)		171,412
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	50,000,000	171,181	1,982		173,163
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	T 4.625 04/30/2029	50,000,000	194,803	(22,030)		172,773
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLR0	T 4.125 10/31/2029	50,000,000	173,743	6,690		180,433
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	50,000,000	169,399	7,970		177,369
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	50,000,000	169,399	8,136		177,535
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	T 4.625 04/30/2029	51,000,000	198,699	(8,728)		189,971
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	T 4.125 11/15/2027	61,000,000	211,967	9,472		221,439
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	T 4.000 02/28/2030	50,000,000	168,478	1,255		169,733
U.S. Treasuries	912797PE1	B 0.000 07/17/2025			187,778		187,778
U.S. Treasuries	912797PF8	B 0.000 07/24/2025			269,931		269,931
U.S. Treasuries	912797QM2	B 0.000 09/02/2025	100,000,000		360,806		360,806
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	T 4.000 01/31/2029	60,000,000	205,417	1,657		207,074
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	T 4.250 02/28/2029	75,000,000	268,512	(12,703)		255,809
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	T 4.375 08/31/2028	50,000,000	184,273	(14,169)		170,104
U.S. Treasuries	91282CND9	T 3.750 05/15/2028	70,000,000	221,128	14,540		235,668
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	195,867	(24,585)		171,283
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	T 3.875 04/30/2030	50,000,000	163,213	9,129		172,342
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFT3	T 4.000 10/31/2029	60,000,000	202,174	225		202,399
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	151,639	(22,675)		128,964
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	145,321	(21,316)		124,005
U.S. Treasuries	912797RP4	B 0.000 11/18/2025	100,000,000		94,022		94,022
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	44,228	(6,420)		37,808
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	30,910	5,973		36,883
Subtotals			**$ 3,912,000,000**	**$ 8,355,708**	**$ 1,340,804**	**$ -**	**$ 9,696,511**
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	FNMA 0.375 08/25/2025	$ 72,500,000	$ 22,656	$ 12,045		$ 34,701
Federal Agencies	3137EAEX3	FHLMC 0.375 09/23/2025	22,600,000	7,063	5,676		12,738
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	FNMA 0.375 08/25/2025	25,000,000	7,813	5,987		13,799
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292			22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292			22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292			22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292			22,292
Federal Agencies	3133EMZ21	FFCB 0.690 04/06/2026	15,500,000	8,913	763		9,675
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396			22,396

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396			22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396			22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396			22,396
Federal Agencies	3130A8ZQ9	FHLB 1.750 09/12/2025	10,295,000	15,014	(6,163)		8,850
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	FFCB 1.050 11/17/2025	55,000,000	48,125	1,634		49,759
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	FFCB 1.050 11/17/2025	39,675,000	34,716	1,120		35,835
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792			29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792			29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792			29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792			29,792
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438			33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438			33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438			33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438			33,438
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	FFCB 1.170 12/16/2025	45,000,000	43,875	974		44,849
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	FFCB 1.170 12/16/2025	50,000,000	48,750	1,082		49,832
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271			34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271			34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271			34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271			34,271
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958			48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958			48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958			48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958			48,958
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	FFCB 1.680 03/10/2027	48,573,000	68,002	19,434		87,436
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	FFCB 2.640 04/08/2026	20,000,000	44,000	823		44,823
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	FFCB 2.640 04/08/2026	30,000,000	66,000	1,235		67,235
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	24,500,000	53,083	2,089		55,172
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	22,500,000	48,750	1,829		50,579
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	25,000,000	54,167	3,329		57,496
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	FFCB 3.240 06/28/2027	27,865,000	75,236	(3,993)		71,242
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	12,375,000	36,094	(3,083)		33,011
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	10,000,000	29,167	(2,453)		26,713
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	21,725,000	63,365	(5,058)		58,307
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ35	FFCB 3.320 02/25/2026	35,000,000	96,833	1,026		97,859
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	21,000,000	72,188	245		72,433
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	5,000,000	17,188	65		17,253
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	4,650,000	15,984	61		16,045
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	25,000,000	85,938	326		86,263
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	FFCB 4.000 12/29/2025	15,000,000	50,000	1,281		51,281
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	FFCB 4.000 12/29/2025	25,000,000	83,333	2,157		85,490
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	FFCB 4.000 12/29/2025	20,000,000	66,667	1,708		68,375
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	FFCB 4.000 01/13/2026	30,000,000	100,000	645		100,645
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	FFCB 4.000 01/13/2026	20,000,000	66,667	498		67,164
Federal Agencies	3130AUTC8	FHLB 4.010 02/06/2026	21,100,000	70,509	3,250		73,759
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026	50,000,000	182,292	2,319		184,611
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	1,315		92,461
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026	28,000,000	102,083	1,299		103,382
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	FFCB 4.125 08/23/2027	10,000,000	34,375	491		34,866

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133EPDL6	FFCB 4.850 10/01/2025	50,000,000	202,083			202,083
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	17,045,000	53,266	1,470		54,735
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026	30,000,000	90,625	2,909		93,534
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026	25,000,000	75,521	2,201		77,722
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025	26,500,000	88,333	609		88,942
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025	30,000,000	100,000	689		100,689
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025	25,000,000	83,333	678		84,011
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	20,000,000	62,500	1,680		64,180
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	15,000,000	50,000	2,819		52,819
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	10,000,000	33,333	1,840		35,173
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	30,000,000	106,250	1,375		107,625
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	20,000,000	70,833	871		71,705
Federal Agencies	3133EPMV4	FFCB 4.125 06/15/2027	28,940,000	99,481	596		100,077
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	24,700,000	87,479	1,691		89,170
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	50,000,000	182,292	750		183,041
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	375		91,521
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	375		91,521
Federal Agencies	3130AWLZ1	FHLB 4.750 06/12/2026	50,000,000	197,917	4,180		202,096
Federal Agencies	3133EPSK2	FFCB 4.250 08/07/2028	19,500,000	69,063	1,489		70,551
Federal Agencies	3133EPSW6	FFCB 4.500 08/14/2026	50,000,000	187,500	3,253		190,753
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	10,000,000	37,500	355		37,855
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	25,000,000	93,750	959		94,709
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	15,000,000	56,250	631		56,881
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	33,000,000	123,750	1,613		125,363
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	19,000,000	75,208	456		75,664
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	10,000,000	39,583	249		39,832
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	21,000,000	83,125	516		83,641
Federal Agencies	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025	8,230,000	34,292	251		34,543
Federal Agencies	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025	15,000,000	62,500	770		63,270
Federal Agencies	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025	20,000,000	83,333	1,026		84,360
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	FFCB 5.125 10/20/2025	50,000,000	213,542	1,187		214,729
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	FFCB 5.125 10/20/2025	25,000,000	106,771	615		107,386
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	FFCB 5.125 10/20/2025	35,000,000	149,479	1,173		150,652
Federal Agencies	3130AXCP1	FHLB 4.875 09/11/2026	11,895,000	48,323	2,138		50,461
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	FFCB 4.875 10/20/2026	30,000,000	121,875	4,692		126,567
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	FFCB 4.875 10/20/2026	14,000,000	56,875	2,689		59,564
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	FFCB 5.125 10/20/2025	24,000,000	102,500	3,247		105,747
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	25,000,000	104,167	1,953		106,120
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	3,000,000	12,500	249		12,749
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	9,615,000	40,063	799		40,861
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	16,000,000	66,667	1,329		67,996
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	10,000,000	40,625	1,658		42,283
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	10,000,000	40,625	1,773		42,398
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	10,000,000	40,625	1,773		42,398
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	FFCB 4.625 11/15/2027	27,950,000	107,724	2,461		110,185
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	FFCB 4.625 11/15/2027	33,300,000	128,344	2,939		131,283
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	12,000,000	46,250	271		46,521
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	20,000,000	77,083	482		77,565
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	55,000,000	211,979	1,319		213,298

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130AXU63	FHLB 4.625 11/17/2026	50,000,000	192,708	2,503		195,212
Federal Agencies	3133EM4X7	FFCB 0.800 09/10/2026	28,975,000	19,317	86,563		105,879
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	FFCB 4.000 05/20/2027	31,000,000	103,333	2,343		105,676
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	FFCB 4.000 05/20/2027	58,850,000	196,167	4,667		200,834
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	35,000,000	120,313	1,247		121,560
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	50,000,000	171,875	1,895		173,770
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	25,000,000	85,938	891		86,828
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	10,000,000	34,375	379		34,754
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	5,000,000	17,188	202		17,390
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	12,000,000	41,250	774		42,024
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	25,000,000	85,938	1,612		87,549
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	29,350,000	100,891	1,892		102,783
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	50,000,000	171,875	3,223		175,098
Federal Agencies	3133EP6K6	FFCB 4.500 03/26/2027	50,000,000	187,500	2,564		190,064
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	36,730,000	149,216	(3,207)		146,008
Federal Agencies	3133EP5K7	FFCB 4.500 03/13/2026	50,000,000	187,500	10,566		198,066
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	25,000,000	101,563	(2,357)		99,206
Federal Agencies	3133EP5U5	FFCB 4.125 03/20/2029	51,660,000	177,581	11,180		188,761
Federal Agencies	3133EP5S0	FFCB 4.250 03/20/2028	4,971,000	17,606	1,169		18,774
Federal Agencies	3130AVBD3	FHLB 4.500 03/09/2029	25,000,000	93,750	(324)		93,426
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	20,000,000	79,167	1,498		80,664
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	17,000,000	67,292	1,273		68,565
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	48,000,000	190,000	3,594		193,594
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	40,000,000	158,333	2,995		161,328
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029	63,085,000	249,711	(11,575)		238,137
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029	27,892,000	110,406	(5,111)		105,294
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029	30,000,000	118,750	(5,412)		113,338
Federal Agencies	3133ERDS7	FFCB 4.750 05/06/2027	12,727,000	50,378	(377)		50,001
Federal Agencies	3130AX4E5	FHLB 4.500 06/11/2027	11,000,000	41,250	1,732		42,982
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	15,000,000	56,250	115		56,365
Federal Agencies	3130B1BT3	FHLB 4.875 06/12/2026	13,485,000	54,783	(860)		53,922
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026	32,000,000	130,000	(2,192)		127,808
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026	20,000,000	81,250	(1,302)		79,948
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	FFCB 4.250 10/20/2028	38,000,000	134,583	4,204		138,788
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	FFCB 4.250 10/20/2028	5,000,000	17,708	546		18,255
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	10,000,000	35,417	555		35,971
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	10,000,000	35,417	555		35,971
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	20,000,000	70,833	1,109		71,943
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	10,000,000	35,417	555		35,971
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	29,000,000	102,708	1,306		104,014
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	20,000,000	75,000	(808)		74,192
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	14,934,000	56,003	(604)		55,399
Federal Agencies	3133ERJZ5	FFCB 4.500 06/28/2027	30,000,000	112,500	401		112,901
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	FFCB 4.500 07/08/2027	25,000,000	93,750	(942)		92,808
Federal Agencies	3130B1EF0	FHLB 4.625 06/11/2027	20,700,000	79,781	(2,781)		77,000
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	FFCB 4.500 07/08/2027	25,000,000	93,750	(723)		93,027
Federal Agencies	3133ERKX8	FFCB 4.250 07/12/2029	20,000,000	70,833	183		71,017
Federal Agencies	3134H16K4	FHLMC 5.380 07/09/2029		29,889			29,889
Federal Agencies	3134H16K4	FHLMC 5.380 07/09/2029		77,711			77,711

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3134H16K4	FHLMC 5.380 07/09/2029		29,889			29,889
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	FFCB 4.250 07/23/2027	10,000,000	35,417	99		35,516
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	FFCB 4.250 07/23/2027	15,000,000	53,125	149		53,274
Federal Agencies	3130B2KJ3	FHLB 4.625 09/04/2029	50,000,000	192,708			192,708
Federal Agencies	3130B2KJ3	FHLB 4.625 09/04/2029	25,000,000	96,354			96,354
Federal Agencies	3130B2KJ3	FHLB 4.625 09/04/2029	25,000,000	96,354			96,354
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	25,000,000	75,521	1,430		76,950
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	50,000,000	151,042	2,859		153,901
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	19,000,000	57,396	1,087		58,482
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	25,900,000	78,240	1,481		79,721
Federal Agencies	3130B2TG0	FHLB 4.375 09/24/2029	25,000,000	91,146			91,146
Federal Agencies	3130B2TG0	FHLB 4.375 09/24/2029	25,000,000	91,146			91,146
Federal Agencies	3130B2TG0	FHLB 4.375 09/24/2029	65,000,000	236,979			236,979
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	15,000,000	51,563	(6,715)		44,848
Federal Agencies	3133ERVR9	FFCB 3.500 07/01/2027	55,000,000	160,417	2,310		162,726
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029	65,000,000	217,208			217,208
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029	25,000,000	83,542			83,542
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029	25,000,000	83,542			83,542
Federal Agencies	3133ERWR8	FFCB 3.500 01/07/2027	12,500,000	36,458	4,767		41,225
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	FFCB 3.875 10/15/2027	8,000,000	25,833	109		25,942
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	FFCB 3.875 10/15/2027	5,000,000	16,146	78		16,224
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	15,000,000	50,000	134		50,134
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	25,000,000	83,333	224		83,557
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	25,000,000	83,333	224		83,557
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	50,000,000	166,667	447		167,114
Federal Agencies	3130B3GD9	FHLB 4.000 11/27/2028	47,025,000	156,750	1,760		158,510
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	15,000,000	51,563	(841)		50,722
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	15,000,000	51,563	(752)		50,811
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	25,590,000	87,966	(1,283)		86,683
Federal Agencies	3133ERD24	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	30,000,000	106,250	622		106,872
Federal Agencies	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029	20,000,000	84,083			84,083
Federal Agencies	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029	62,000,000	260,658			260,658
Federal Agencies	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029	20,000,000	84,083			84,083
Federal Agencies	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029	20,000,000	84,083			84,083
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	38,343,000	131,804	3,288		135,092
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	25,505,000	87,673	2,180		89,854
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	21,000,000	72,188	1,801		73,989
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	33,000,000	113,438	3,046		116,484
Federal Agencies	3133ERT84	FFCB 4.250 01/14/2028	29,750,000	105,365	4,927		110,292
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	FFCB 4.250 01/28/2028	50,000,000	177,083	724		177,807
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	FFCB 4.250 01/28/2028	47,000,000	166,458	680		167,139
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	FFCB 4.250 11/03/2027	41,880,000	148,325	70		148,395
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	FFCB 4.250 11/03/2027	5,000,000	17,708	20		17,728
Federal Agencies	3136GAAR0	FNMA 4.690 02/07/2028	25,000,000	97,708			97,708
Federal Agencies	3136GAAR0	FNMA 4.690 02/07/2028	50,000,000	195,417			195,417
Federal Agencies	3136GAAR0	FNMA 4.690 02/07/2028	25,000,000	97,708			97,708
Federal Agencies	3136GAAR0	FNMA 4.690 02/07/2028	25,000,000	97,708			97,708
Federal Agencies	3136GAAR0	FNMA 4.690 02/07/2028	25,000,000	97,708			97,708
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	30,000,000	106,250	1,376		107,626

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	25,000,000	88,542	1,093		89,635
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	2,000,000	7,083	91		7,174
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	FFCB 4.500 01/18/2030	12,815,000	48,056	(3,650)		44,406
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	FFCB 4.500 01/18/2030	18,000,000	67,500	(5,101)		62,399
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	32,260,000	107,533	275		107,808
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	46,750,000	155,833	295		156,128
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	15,000,000	50,000	107		50,107
Federal Agencies	3136GAFL8	FNMA 4.710 10/15/2029	50,000,000	196,250			196,250
Federal Agencies	3136GAFL8	FNMA 4.710 10/15/2029	25,000,000	98,125			98,125
Federal Agencies	3136GAFL8	FNMA 4.710 10/15/2029	25,000,000	98,125			98,125
Federal Agencies	3136GAFL8	FNMA 4.710 10/15/2029	25,000,000	98,125			98,125
Federal Agencies	3136GAFL8	FNMA 4.710 10/15/2029	25,000,000	98,125			98,125
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	43,020,000	143,400	1,974		145,374
Federal Agencies	3133ER7L9	FFCB 4.000 03/18/2030	8,695,000	28,983	402		29,385
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	50,000,000	166,667	8,084		174,750
Federal Agencies	3130AWC24	FHLB 4.000 06/09/2028	10,000,000	33,333	94		33,427
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	FFCB 4.000 02/23/2027	45,000,000	150,000	1,349		151,349
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	FFCB 4.000 02/23/2027	10,000,000	33,333	300		33,633
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	FFCB 4.000 11/30/2029	15,000,000	50,000	1,029		51,029
Federal Agencies	3133ETJS7	FFCB 4.000 11/10/2026	12,600,000	42,000	1,091		43,091
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	FFCB 4.000 11/30/2029	23,000,000	76,667	1,469		78,136
Federal Agencies	3130B6MU7	FHLB 4.590 06/15/2028	50,000,000	191,250			191,250
Federal Agencies	3130B6MU7	FHLB 4.590 06/15/2028	25,000,000	95,625			95,625
Federal Agencies	3130B6MU7	FHLB 4.590 06/15/2028	25,000,000	95,625			95,625
Federal Agencies	3130B6MU7	FHLB 4.590 06/15/2028	25,000,000	95,625			95,625
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	FFCB 3.875 06/05/2028	25,000,000	80,729	1,209		81,938
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	20,000,000	66,667	934		67,600
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	10,000,000	33,333	441		33,775
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	FFCB 4.000 10/09/2029	15,000,000	50,000	367		50,367
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	FFCB 4.000 10/09/2029	10,000,000	33,333	245		33,578
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	FFCB 3.875 06/05/2028	7,370,000	23,799	780		24,579
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	16,500,000	53,281	944		54,225
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	10,000,000	32,292	572		32,864
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	20,000,000	64,583	1,144		65,727
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	13,000,000	41,979	743		42,723
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	36,000,000	116,250	2,059		118,309
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	25,000,000	83,333	999		84,333
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	14,450,000	48,167	578		48,744
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	5,000,000	16,667	193		16,860
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	FHLB 4.125 06/14/2030	16,000,000	55,000	(1,078)		53,922
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	25,000,000	83,333	598		83,932
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	50,000,000	125,000	3,903		128,903
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	22,500,000	56,250	1,736		57,986
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	41,000,000	104,778	(469)		104,309
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	15,000,000	38,333	(172)		38,162
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	10,070,000	25,734	(104)		25,630
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	25,000,000	59,896	2,112		62,008
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	15,000,000	36,667	17		36,684
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	9,750,000	23,833	50		23,883

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	16,944,000	41,419	86		41,505
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	FHLB 4.125 06/14/2030	12,515,000	31,548	(823)		30,725
Federal Agencies	3133ETPF8	FFCB 3.750 07/08/2030	20,000,000	35,417	2,213		37,630
Federal Agencies	313385JN7	FHDN 0.000 07/24/2025			11,694		11,694
Federal Agencies	3130B1BC0	FHLB 4.625 06/08/2029	9,705,000		(169)		(169)
Subtotals			**$ 6,735,329,000**	**$ 20,842,057**	**$ 305,093**	**$ -**	**$ 21,147,150**
Public Time Deposits	PPGR18NT6	BRIDGE 4.300 07/14/2025		$ 17,239			$ 17,239
Public Time Deposits	PPGR8L735	BKSANF 4.330 07/07/2025		7,217			7,217
Public Time Deposits	PPGQE6C86	FIVSTR 4.290 11/17/2025	20,000,000	73,883			73,883
Public Time Deposits	PPGUALS16	BKSANF 4.310 12/08/2025	10,000,000	37,114			37,114
Public Time Deposits	PPGQEWEX2	BRIDGE 4.340 12/15/2025	10,000,000	36,860			36,860
Public Time Deposits	PPGZ3O8Q4	BKSANF 4.330 01/05/2026	10,000,000	30,069			30,069
Public Time Deposits	PPGUCT9Z3	BRIDGE 4.330 01/12/2026	10,000,000	21,353			21,353
Subtotals			**$ 60,000,000**	**$ 223,736**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 223,736**
Negotiable CDs	78015JTB3	RY 5.090 07/14/2025		$ 91,903			$ 91,903
Negotiable CDs	78015JVF1	RY 4.610 07/01/2025		0			0
Negotiable CDs	78015J2U0	RY 4.530 07/28/2025		390,712			390,712
Negotiable CDs	06367DMU6	BMOCHG 4.590 08/11/2025	65,000,000	256,913			256,913
Negotiable CDs	78015J2Y2	RY 4.550 09/08/2025	65,000,000	254,674			254,674
Negotiable CDs	78015J3L9	RY 4.510 11/20/2025	60,000,000	233,017			233,017
Negotiable CDs	06367DMX0	BMOCHG 4.570 10/24/2025	50,000,000	196,764			196,764
Negotiable CDs	13606DCE0	CIBCNY 4.550 10/24/2025	50,000,000	195,903			195,903
Negotiable CDs	78015J3U9	RY 4.560 11/19/2025	50,000,000	196,333			196,333
Negotiable CDs	06367DN84	BMOCHG 4.580 07/02/2025		6,361			6,361
Negotiable CDs	13606DCT7	CIBCNY 4.580 07/02/2025		6,361			6,361
Negotiable CDs	13606DCV2	CIBCNY 4.530 09/22/2025	75,000,000	292,563			292,563
Negotiable CDs	06367DN92	BMOCHG 4.530 09/22/2025	50,000,000	195,042			195,042
Negotiable CDs	78015JAG2	RY 4.430 07/14/2025		115,180			115,180
Negotiable CDs	13606DDU3	CIBCNY 4.500 07/23/2025		206,250			206,250
Negotiable CDs	78015JC47	RY 4.410 08/11/2025	66,000,000	250,635			250,635
Negotiable CDs	06367DNQ4	BMOCHG 4.450 07/30/2025		179,236			179,236
Negotiable CDs	13606DFF4	CIBCNY 4.420 09/24/2025	110,000,000	418,672			418,672
Negotiable CDs	89115DPK6	TDNY 4.490 10/24/2025	100,000,000	386,639			386,639
Negotiable CDs	89115DQB5	TDNY 4.450 07/01/2025		0			0
Negotiable CDs	89115DQF6	TDNY 4.450 07/03/2025		4,944			4,944
Negotiable CDs	89115DQT6	TDNY 4.540 01/12/2026	100,000,000	390,944			390,944
Negotiable CDs	89115DWB8	TDNY 4.360 09/05/2025	50,000,000	187,722			187,722
Negotiable CDs	89115DWF9	TDNY 4.360 09/10/2025	50,000,000	187,722			187,722
Negotiable CDs	89115DWK8	TDNY 4.350 11/05/2025	50,000,000	187,292			187,292
Negotiable CDs	06367DPW9	BMOCHG 4.350 10/24/2025	50,000,000	187,292			187,292
Negotiable CDs	13606DGY2	CIBCNY 4.360 01/22/2026	60,000,000	225,267			225,267
Negotiable CDs	13606DGZ9	CIBCNY 4.360 01/28/2026	80,000,000	300,356			300,356
Negotiable CDs	89115DWT9	TDNY 4.360 01/28/2026	50,000,000	187,722			187,722
Negotiable CDs	06367DQ32	BMOCHG 4.330 02/09/2026	75,000,000	279,646			279,646
Negotiable CDs	13606DHE5	CIBCNY 4.340 12/15/2025	75,000,000	280,292			280,292
Negotiable CDs	13606DHF2	CIBCNY 4.330 02/09/2026	50,000,000	186,431			186,431
Negotiable CDs	89115DXB7	TDNY 4.340 12/15/2025	60,000,000	224,233			224,233

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Negotiable CDs	89115DXF8	TDNY 4.340 12/29/2025	65,000,000	242,919			242,919
Negotiable CDs	96130AZR2	WSTNY 4.350 12/03/2025	100,000,000	374,583			374,583
Negotiable CDs	13606DKH4	CIBCNY 4.330 01/20/2026	60,000,000	223,717			223,717
Negotiable CDs	06367DQK4	BMOCHG 4.320 01/12/2026	50,000,000	186,000			186,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DQP3	BMOCHG 4.430 02/11/2026	70,000,000	267,031			267,031
Negotiable CDs	96130AZZ4	WSTNY 4.350 05/04/2026	125,000,000	468,229			468,229
Negotiable CDs	78015JG84	RY 4.330 02/23/2026	60,000,000	223,717			223,717
Negotiable CDs	96130AA24	WSTNY 4.350 03/16/2026	100,000,000	374,583			374,583
Negotiable CDs	96130AA65	WSTNY 4.380 03/23/2026	140,000,000	528,033			528,033
Negotiable CDs	89115DEG7	TDNY 4.410 03/11/2026	50,000,000	189,875			189,875
Negotiable CDs	78015JGQ4	RY 4.380 03/06/2026	50,000,000	188,583			188,583
Negotiable CDs	89115DHC3	TDNY 4.400 03/16/2026	60,000,000	227,333			227,333
Negotiable CDs	96130AC22	WSTNY 4.320 06/15/2026	100,000,000	372,000			372,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DRH0	BMOCHG 4.330 03/24/2026	50,000,000	186,431			186,431
Negotiable CDs	06367DRJ6	BMOCHG 4.330 03/25/2026	50,000,000	186,431			186,431
Negotiable CDs	78015JJ81	RY 4.290 03/16/2026	100,000,000	369,417			369,417
Negotiable CDs	78015JJQ1	RY 4.330 04/07/2026	50,000,000	138,319			138,319
Negotiable CDs	06418NHV7	BNSHOU 4.270 07/01/2026	100,000,000	94,889			94,889
Subtotals			**$ 2,871,000,000**	**$ 11,545,110**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 11,545,110**
Commercial Paper	89233GVR4	TOYCC 0.000 08/25/2025	$ 65,000,000		$ 248,517		$ 248,517
Commercial Paper	89233GW85	TOYCC 0.000 09/08/2025	65,000,000		243,479		243,479
Commercial Paper	89233GX84	TOYCC 0.000 10/08/2025	60,000,000		222,167		222,167
Commercial Paper	89233GXQ4	TOYCC 0.000 10/24/2025	50,000,000		186,431		186,431
Commercial Paper	89233GXP6	TOYCC 0.000 10/23/2025	75,000,000		286,104		286,104
Commercial Paper	89233GZ17	TOYCC 0.000 12/01/2025	125,000,000		451,007		451,007
Commercial Paper	89233GZF6	TOYCC 0.000 12/15/2025	75,000,000		269,958		269,958
Commercial Paper	62479LUF0	MUFGBK 0.000 07/15/2025			25,375		25,375
Commercial Paper	62479LUJ2	MUFGBK 0.000 07/18/2025			30,813		30,813
Commercial Paper	62479LUG8	MUFGBK 0.000 07/16/2025			36,000		36,000
Commercial Paper	62479LV51	MUFGBK 0.000 08/05/2025	25,000,000		92,785		92,785
Commercial Paper	62479LWF8	MUFGBK 0.000 09/15/2025	20,000,000		73,367		73,367
Commercial Paper	62479LWP6	MUFGBK 0.000 09/23/2025	35,000,000		128,392		128,392
Commercial Paper	62479LX67	MUFGBK 0.000 10/06/2025	25,000,000		91,493		91,493
Commercial Paper	62479LXF7	MUFGBK 0.000 10/15/2025	11,000,000		40,162		40,162
Commercial Paper	62479LXL4	MUFGBK 0.000 10/20/2025	15,000,000		54,767		54,767
Commercial Paper	62479LXN0	MUFGBK 0.000 10/22/2025	55,000,000		200,811		200,811
Commercial Paper	19121AUA7	KOPP 0.000 07/10/2025			54,125		54,125
Commercial Paper	03785DWF9	APPINC 0.000 09/15/2025	10,000,000		36,167		36,167
Commercial Paper	62479LY33	MUFGBK 0.000 11/03/2025	10,000,000		37,372		37,372
Commercial Paper	62479LY74	MUFGBK 0.000 11/07/2025	11,000,000		41,015		41,015
Commercial Paper	62479LYH2	MUFGBK 0.000 11/17/2025	38,000,000		141,033		141,033
Commercial Paper	62479LYM1	MUFGBK 0.000 11/21/2025	26,000,000		96,496		96,496
Commercial Paper	62479LYS8	MUFGBK 0.000 11/26/2025	15,000,000		55,542		55,542
Commercial Paper	62479LV51	MUFGBK 0.000 08/05/2025	110,000,000		416,778		416,778
Commercial Paper	89116EZ55	TDHUSA 0.000 12/05/2025	11,000,000		40,257		40,257
Commercial Paper	89116EZF3	TDHUSA 0.000 12/15/2025	25,000,000		91,278		91,278
Commercial Paper	89116EZP1	TDHUSA 0.000 12/23/2025	40,000,000		145,011		145,011
Commercial Paper	62479MB69	MUFGBK 0.000 02/06/2026	25,000,000		92,354		92,354

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Commercial Paper	62479MC92	MUFGBK 0.000 03/09/2026	130,000,000		482,481		482,481
Commercial Paper	62479MCQ4	MUFGBK 0.000 03/24/2026	100,000,000		295,139		295,139
Commercial Paper	14912DUU1	CATFIN 0.000 07/28/2025			204,000		204,000
Commercial Paper	03785DUP9	APPINC 0.000 07/23/2025			12,183		12,183
Commercial Paper	14912DUV9	CATFIN 0.000 07/29/2025			31,294		31,294
Commercial Paper	62479MD67	MUFGBK 0.000 04/06/2026	110,000,000		52,189		52,189
Commercial Paper	14912DVE6	CATFIN 0.000 08/14/2025	80,000,000		28,867		28,867
Subtotals			**$ 1,442,000,000**	**$ -**	**$ 5,035,206**	**$ -**	**$ 5,035,206**
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026	$ 6,452,000	$ 18,281	$ 7,033		$ 25,314
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026	13,009,000	36,859	14,105		50,963
Medium Term Notes	91324PFF4	UNH 4.750 07/15/2026	15,000,000	59,375	1,085		60,460
Medium Term Notes	24422EXV6	DE 4.200 07/15/2027	10,000,000	35,000	42		35,042
Medium Term Notes	14913UAN0	CAT 4.450 10/16/2026	18,385,000	68,178	(8,805)		59,373
Medium Term Notes	037833CJ7	AAPL 3.350 02/09/2027	50,000,000	139,583	14,684		154,268
Medium Term Notes	594918BJ2	MSFT 3.125 11/03/2025	11,749,000	30,596	7,601		38,197
Medium Term Notes	89236TMY8	TOYOTA 4.600 01/08/2027	40,000,000	153,333	936		154,269
Medium Term Notes	24422EYD5	DE 4.250 06/05/2028	25,000,000	88,542	629		89,171
Subtotals			**$ 189,595,000**	**$ 629,747**	**$ 37,309**	**$ -**	**$ 667,056**
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	$ 14,369,625	$ 50,919			$ 50,919
Money Market Funds	31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	889,192,291	3,192,316			3,192,316
Money Market Funds	608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	407,722,486	859,961			859,961
Money Market Funds	262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	14,948,556	53,082			53,082
Money Market Funds	85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	33,285,922	835,968			835,968
Money Market Funds	61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	18,527,572	67,233			67,233
Subtotals			**$ 1,378,046,452**	**$ 5,059,480**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 5,059,480**
Supranationals	45818WDG8	IADB 0.820 02/27/2026	$ 19,500,000	$ 13,325	$ (1,071)		$ 12,254
Supranationals	4581X0DN5	IADB 0.625 07/15/2025		7,024	3,944		10,969
Supranationals	45950VRU2	IFC 4.023 01/26/2026	100,000,000	335,250			335,250
Supranationals	4581X0EN4	IADB 4.125 02/15/2029	25,000,000	85,938	6,469		92,407
Supranationals	459058KJ1	IBRD 3.125 06/15/2027	12,323,000	32,091	11,335		43,426
Supranationals	4581X0EN4	IADB 4.125 02/15/2029	50,000,000	171,875	3,204		175,079
Subtotals			**$ 206,823,000**	**$ 645,503**	**$ 23,881**	**$ -**	**$ 669,384**
Secured Bank Deposit	0660P0999	Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct	$ 359,756,956	$ 1,324,237			$ 1,324,237
Subtotals			**$ 359,756,956**	**$ 1,324,237**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 1,324,237**
Grand Totals			**$17,154,550,408**	**$ 48,625,577**	**$ 6,742,293**	**$ -**	**$ 55,367,870**

Investment Transactions
Pooled Fund

For month ended July 31, 2025

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Price	Settlement Date	Posted Date	Par Value	Principal	Accrued Interest	Total
58732	Buy	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	99.65900	07/07/2025	07/07/2025	50,000,000.00	49,829,500.00	20,833.33	49,850,333.33
58733	Buy	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	99.66300	07/07/2025	07/07/2025	22,500,000.00	22,424,175.00	9,375.00	22,433,550.00
58734	Buy	PPGZ3O8Q	BKSANF 4.330 01/05/2026	100.00000	07/07/2025	07/07/2025	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	0.00	10,000,000.00
58736	Buy	62479MCQ4	MUFGBK 0.000 03/24/2026	96.93056	07/07/2025	07/07/2025	100,000,000.00	96,930,555.56	0.00	96,930,555.56
58735	Buy	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	101.33594	07/08/2025	07/08/2025	50,000,000.00	50,667,968.75	145,321.04	50,813,289.79
58737	Buy	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	100.08600	07/08/2025	07/08/2025	41,000,000.00	41,035,260.00	95,666.67	41,130,926.67
58738	Buy	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	100.08600	07/08/2025	07/08/2025	15,000,000.00	15,012,900.00	35,000.00	15,047,900.00
58739	Buy	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	100.07800	07/08/2025	07/08/2025	10,070,000.00	10,077,854.60	23,496.67	10,101,351.27
58740	Buy	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	99.61600	07/08/2025	07/08/2025	25,000,000.00	24,904,000.00	13,020.83	24,917,020.83
58742	Buy	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	99.99100	07/09/2025	07/09/2025	15,000,000.00	14,998,650.00	48,333.33	15,046,983.33
58743	Buy	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	99.96000	07/09/2025	07/09/2025	9,750,000.00	9,746,100.00	31,416.67	9,777,516.67
58744	Buy	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	101.30859	07/09/2025	07/09/2025	50,000,000.00	50,654,296.88	151,639.34	50,805,936.22
58745	Buy	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	99.96000	07/09/2025	07/09/2025	16,944,000.00	16,937,222.40	41,418.67	16,978,641.07
58746	Buy	3130AWGS3	FHLB 4.125 06/14/2030	100.51500	07/09/2025	07/09/2025	12,515,000.00	12,579,452.25	35,850.26	12,615,302.51
58747	Buy	78015JJQ1	RY 4.330 04/07/2026	100.00000	07/09/2025	07/09/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
58748	Buy	14912DUU1	CATFIN 0.000 07/28/2025	99.79600	07/11/2025	07/11/2025	100,000,000.00	99,796,000.00	0.00	99,796,000.00
58741	Buy	PPGUCT9Z3	BRIDGE 4.330 01/12/2026	100.00000	07/14/2025	07/14/2025	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	0.00	10,000,000.00
58749	Buy	3133ETPF8	FFCB 3.750 07/08/2030	98.88100	07/14/2025	07/14/2025	20,000,000.00	19,776,200.00	12,500.00	19,788,700.00
58750	Buy	03785DUP9	APPINC 0.000 07/23/2025	99.97611	07/21/2025	07/21/2025	34,000,000.00	33,991,877.78	0.00	33,991,877.78
58753	Buy	313385JN7	FHDN 0.000 07/24/2025	99.98831	07/23/2025	07/23/2025	100,000,000.00	99,988,305.56	0.00	99,988,305.56
58751	Buy	912797RP4	B 0.000 11/18/2025	98.62493	07/24/2025	07/24/2025	100,000,000.00	98,624,925.00	0.00	98,624,925.00
58752	Buy	06418NHV7	BNSHOU 4.270 07/01/2026	100.00000	07/24/2025	07/24/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
58754	Buy	14912DUV9	CATFIN 0.000 07/29/2025	99.94028	07/24/2025	07/24/2025	52,400,000.00	52,368,705.56	0.00	52,368,705.56
58755	Buy	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	101.26563	07/25/2025	07/25/2025	50,000,000.00	50,632,812.50	252,732.24	50,885,544.74
58756	Buy	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	98.79688	07/25/2025	07/25/2025	50,000,000.00	49,398,437.50	110,394.02	49,508,831.52
58757	Buy	62479MD67	MUFGBK 0.000 04/06/2026	97.01100	07/28/2025	07/28/2025	110,000,000.00	106,712,100.00	0.00	106,712,100.00
58758	Buy	14912DVE6	CATFIN 0.000 08/14/2025	99.80756	07/29/2025	07/29/2025	80,000,000.00	79,846,044.44	0.00	79,846,044.44
58759	Buy	3130B1BC0	FHLB 4.625 06/08/2029	102.45600	07/31/2025	07/31/2025	9,705,000.00	9,943,354.80	66,081.61	10,009,436.41
			Activity Total				1,293,884,000.00	1,286,876,698.58	1,093,079.68	1,287,969,778.26

Investment Transactions

Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Price	Settlement Date	Posted Date	Par Value	Principal	Accrued Interest	Total
58241	Maturity	78015JVF1	RY 4.610 07/01/2025	100.00000	07/01/2025	07/01/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
58544	Maturity	89115DQB5	TDNY 4.450 07/01/2025	100.00000	07/01/2025	07/01/2025	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00	0.00	35,000,000.00
58456	Maturity	06367DN84	BMOCHG 4.580 07/02/2025	100.00000	07/02/2025	07/02/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
58457	Maturity	13606DCT7	CIBCNY 4.580 07/02/2025	100.00000	07/02/2025	07/02/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
58545	Maturity	89115DQF6	TDNY 4.450 07/03/2025	100.00000	07/03/2025	07/03/2025	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00	0.00	20,000,000.00
58600	Maturity	PPGR8L735	BKSANF 4.330 07/07/2025	100.00000	07/07/2025	07/07/2025	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	0.00	10,000,000.00
58078	Full Call	3134H16K4	FHLMC 5.380 07/09/2029	100.00000	07/09/2025	07/09/2025	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	0.00	25,000,000.00
58079	Full Call	3134H16K4	FHLMC 5.380 07/09/2029	100.00000	07/09/2025	07/09/2025	65,000,000.00	65,000,000.00	0.00	65,000,000.00
58080	Full Call	3134H16K4	FHLMC 5.380 07/09/2029	100.00000	07/09/2025	07/09/2025	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	0.00	25,000,000.00
58621	Maturity	19121AUA7	KOPP 0.000 07/10/2025	100.00000	07/10/2025	07/10/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
58485	Maturity	78015JAG2	RY 4.430 07/14/2025	100.00000	07/14/2025	07/14/2025	72,000,000.00	72,000,000.00	0.00	72,000,000.00
58100	Maturity	78015JTB3	RY 5.090 07/14/2025	100.00000	07/14/2025	07/14/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
58517	Maturity	PPGR18NT6	BRIDGE 4.300 07/14/2025	100.00000	07/14/2025	07/14/2025	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	0.00	10,000,000.00
47193	Maturity	4581X0DN5	IADB 0.625 07/15/2025	100.00000	07/15/2025	07/15/2025	28,900,000.00	28,900,000.00	0.00	28,900,000.00
58578	Maturity	62479LUF0	MUFGBK 0.000 07/15/2025	100.00000	07/15/2025	07/15/2025	15,000,000.00	15,000,000.00	0.00	15,000,000.00
58591	Maturity	62479LUG8	MUFGBK 0.000 07/16/2025	100.00000	07/16/2025	07/16/2025	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00	0.00	20,000,000.00
58625	Maturity	912797PE1	B 0.000 07/17/2025	100.00000	07/17/2025	07/17/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
58579	Maturity	62479LUJ2	MUFGBK 0.000 07/18/2025	100.00000	07/18/2025	07/18/2025	15,000,000.00	15,000,000.00	0.00	15,000,000.00
58750	Maturity	03785DUP9	APPINC 0.000 07/23/2025	100.00000	07/23/2025	07/23/2025	34,000,000.00	34,000,000.00	0.00	34,000,000.00
58490	Maturity	13606DDU3	CIBCNY 4.500 07/23/2025	100.00000	07/23/2025	07/23/2025	75,000,000.00	75,000,000.00	0.00	75,000,000.00
58753	Maturity	313385JN7	FHDN 0.000 07/24/2025	100.00000	07/24/2025	07/24/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
58639	Maturity	912797PF8	B 0.000 07/24/2025	100.00000	07/24/2025	07/24/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
58748	Maturity	14912DUU1	CATFIN 0.000 07/28/2025	100.00000	07/28/2025	07/28/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
58443	Maturity	78015J2U0	RY 4.530 07/28/2025	100.00000	07/28/2025	07/28/2025	115,000,000.00	115,000,000.00	0.00	115,000,000.00
58754	Maturity	14912DUV9	CATFIN 0.000 07/29/2025	100.00000	07/29/2025	07/29/2025	52,400,000.00	52,400,000.00	0.00	52,400,000.00
58516	Maturity	06367DNQ4	BMOCHG 4.450 07/30/2025	100.00000	07/30/2025	07/30/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
47110	Maturity	91282CAB7	T 0.250 07/31/2025	100.00000	07/31/2025	07/31/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
47114	Maturity	91282CAB7	T 0.250 07/31/2025	100.00000	07/31/2025	07/31/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
			Activity Total				1,417,300,000.00	1,417,300,000.00	0.00	1,417,300,000.00

Interest Received
Pooled Fund

For month ended July 31, 2025

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Date Posted	Interest Received	Purchased Interest Adjustment	Net Interest
58394	Interest Income	3133ERVR9	FFCB 3.500 07/01/2027	07/01/2025	962,500.00		962,500.00
58544	Interest Income	89115DQB5	TDNY 4.450 07/01/2025	07/01/2025	610,020.85		610,020.85
58241	Interest Income	78015JVF1	RY 4.610 07/01/2025	07/01/2025	2,048,888.90		2,048,888.90
58395	Interest Income	3130B2XR1	FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029	07/02/2025	1,954,875.00		1,954,875.00
58396	Interest Income	3130B2XR1	FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029	07/02/2025	751,875.00		751,875.00
58397	Interest Income	3130B2XR1	FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029	07/02/2025	751,875.00		751,875.00
58456	Interest Income	06367DN84	BMOCHG 4.580 07/02/2025	07/02/2025	1,342,194.45		1,342,194.45
58457	Interest Income	13606DCT7	CIBCNY 4.580 07/02/2025	07/02/2025	1,342,194.45		1,342,194.45
58545	Interest Income	89115DQF6	TDNY 4.450 07/03/2025	07/03/2025	353,527.78		353,527.78
58414	Interest Income	3133ERWR8	FFCB 3.500 01/07/2027	07/07/2025	218,750.00		218,750.00
58600	Interest Income	PPGR8L735	BKSANF 4.330 07/07/2025	07/07/2025	109,452.78		109,452.78
58515	Interest Income	89236TMY8	TOYOTA 4.600 01/08/2027	07/08/2025	914,888.88		914,888.88
57735	Interest Income	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	07/08/2025	451,250.00		451,250.00
57736	Interest Income	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	07/08/2025	237,500.00		237,500.00
57737	Interest Income	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	07/08/2025	498,750.00		498,750.00
58063	Interest Income	3133ERKM2	FFCB 4.500 07/08/2027	07/08/2025	562,500.00		562,500.00
58072	Interest Income	3133ERKM2	FFCB 4.500 07/08/2027	07/08/2025	562,500.00		562,500.00
58078	Interest Income	3134H16K4	FHLMC 5.380 07/09/2029	07/09/2025	672,500.00		672,500.00
58079	Interest Income	3134H16K4	FHLMC 5.380 07/09/2029	07/09/2025	1,748,500.00		1,748,500.00
58080	Interest Income	3134H16K4	FHLMC 5.380 07/09/2029	07/09/2025	672,500.00		672,500.00
58485	Interest Income	78015JAG2	RY 4.430 07/14/2025	07/14/2025	1,896,040.01		1,896,040.01
58517	Interest Income	PPGR18NT6	BRIDGE 4.300 07/14/2025	07/14/2025	216,335.06		216,335.06
58518	Interest Income	3133ERT84	FFCB 4.250 01/14/2028	07/14/2025	632,187.50		632,187.50
47125	Interest Income	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	07/14/2025	131,250.00		131,250.00
47126	Interest Income	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	07/14/2025	131,250.00		131,250.00
47127	Interest Income	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	07/14/2025	131,250.00		131,250.00
47128	Interest Income	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	07/14/2025	131,250.00		131,250.00
47271	Interest Income	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	07/14/2025	205,625.00		205,625.00
47272	Interest Income	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	07/14/2025	205,625.00		205,625.00
47273	Interest Income	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	07/14/2025	205,625.00		205,625.00
47274	Interest Income	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	07/14/2025	205,625.00		205,625.00
57567	Interest Income	3133EN6A3	FFCB 4.000 01/13/2026	07/14/2025	600,000.00		600,000.00
57568	Interest Income	3133EN6A3	FFCB 4.000 01/13/2026	07/14/2025	400,000.00		400,000.00
58077	Interest Income	3133ERKX8	FFCB 4.250 07/12/2029	07/14/2025	425,000.00		425,000.00
58100	Interest Income	78015JTB3	RY 5.090 07/14/2025	07/14/2025	2,566,208.35		2,566,208.35
47193	Interest Income	4581X0DN5	IADB 0.625 07/15/2025	07/15/2025	90,312.50		90,312.50
57840	Interest Income	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	07/15/2025	247,500.00		247,500.00
57841	Interest Income	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	07/15/2025	515,625.00		515,625.00
57842	Interest Income	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	07/15/2025	605,343.75		605,343.75
57843	Interest Income	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	07/15/2025	1,031,250.00		1,031,250.00
58131	Interest Income	91324PFF4	UNH 4.750 07/15/2026	07/15/2025	356,250.00		356,250.00
58320	Interest Income	24422EXV6	DE 4.200 07/15/2027	07/16/2025	210,000.00		210,000.00
58583	Interest Income	3133ER4H1	FFCB 4.500 01/18/2030	07/18/2025	240,281.25	59,269.38	181,011.87
58584	Interest Income	3133ER4H1	FFCB 4.500 01/18/2030	07/18/2025	337,500.00	83,250.00	254,250.00
58490	Interest Income	13606DDU3	CIBCNY 4.500 07/23/2025	07/23/2025	2,081,250.00		2,081,250.00
58721	Interest Income	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	07/23/2025	83,333.33		83,333.33
58722	Interest Income	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	07/23/2025	48,166.67		48,166.67
58723	Interest Income	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	07/23/2025	16,666.67		16,666.67

Interest Received
Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Date Posted	Interest Received	Purchased Interest Adjustment	Net Interest
58116	Interest Income	3133ERMB4	FFCB 4.250 07/23/2027	07/23/2025	212,500.00		212,500.00
58117	Interest Income	3133ERMB4	FFCB 4.250 07/23/2027	07/23/2025	318,750.00		318,750.00
57835	Interest Income	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	07/25/2025	721,875.00		721,875.00
57836	Interest Income	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	07/25/2025	1,031,250.00		1,031,250.00
57837	Interest Income	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	07/25/2025	515,625.00		515,625.00
57838	Interest Income	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	07/25/2025	206,250.00		206,250.00
57839	Interest Income	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	07/25/2025	103,125.00		103,125.00
58443	Interest Income	78015J2U0	RY 4.530 07/28/2025	07/28/2025	3,704,533.30		3,704,533.30
58522	Interest Income	3133ERZ46	FFCB 4.250 01/28/2028	07/28/2025	1,062,500.00	17,708.33	1,044,791.67
58523	Interest Income	3133ERZ46	FFCB 4.250 01/28/2028	07/28/2025	998,750.00	16,645.83	982,104.17
47118	Interest Income	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	07/28/2025	133,750.00		133,750.00
47119	Interest Income	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	07/28/2025	133,750.00		133,750.00
47120	Interest Income	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	07/28/2025	133,750.00		133,750.00
47121	Interest Income	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	07/28/2025	133,750.00		133,750.00
58516	Interest Income	06367DNQ4	BMOCHG 4.450 07/30/2025	07/30/2025	1,260,833.35		1,260,833.35
57772	Interest Income	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	07/30/2025	625,000.00		625,000.00
57773	Interest Income	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	07/30/2025	75,000.00		75,000.00
57774	Interest Income	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	07/30/2025	240,375.00		240,375.00
57775	Interest Income	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	07/30/2025	400,000.00		400,000.00
58400	Interest Income	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	07/31/2025	1,000,000.00		1,000,000.00
58406	Interest Income	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	07/31/2025	1,300,000.00		1,300,000.00
58413	Interest Income	91282CJW2	T 4.000 01/31/2029	07/31/2025	1,300,000.00		1,300,000.00
58431	Interest Income	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	07/31/2025	1,000,000.00		1,000,000.00
47110	Interest Income	91282CAB7	T 0.250 07/31/2025	07/31/2025	62,500.00		62,500.00
58669	Interest Income	91282CJW2	T 4.000 01/31/2029	07/31/2025	1,200,000.00	676,243.09	523,756.91
47114	Interest Income	91282CAB7	T 0.250 07/31/2025	07/31/2025	62,500.00		62,500.00
			Activity Total		48,650,159.83	853,116.63	47,797,043.20

Money Market / Secured Bank Deposit Activity
Pooled Fund

For month ended July 31, 2025				
Accounting ID	**Description**	**Activity Date**	**Transaction Type**	**Transaction Amount**
09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	07/31/2025	Interest Received	50,919.42
	Activity Total			50,919.42
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	07/31/2025	Interest Received	3,192,316.39
	Activity Total			3,192,316.39
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	07/01/2025	Withdrawal	(200,000,000.00)
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	07/03/2025	Withdrawal	(37,000,000.00)
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	07/07/2025	Withdrawal	(75,000,000.00)
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	07/14/2025	Withdrawal	(30,000,000.00)
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	07/17/2025	Deposit	65,000,000.00
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	07/18/2025	Deposit	30,000,000.00
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	07/21/2025	Deposit	15,000,000.00
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	07/22/2025	Deposit	10,000,000.00
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	07/24/2025	Withdrawal	(37,000,000.00)
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	07/29/2025	Deposit	30,000,000.00
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	07/31/2025	Deposit	135,000,000.00
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	07/31/2025	Interest Received	859,961.10
	Activity Total			(93,140,038.90)
262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	07/31/2025	Interest Received	53,082.02
	Activity Total			53,082.02
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	07/01/2025	Withdrawal	(200,000,000.00)
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	07/07/2025	Withdrawal	(150,000,000.00)
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	07/08/2025	Withdrawal	(150,000,000.00)
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	07/09/2025	Withdrawal	(55,000,000.00)
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	07/11/2025	Withdrawal	(140,000,000.00)
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	07/15/2025	Deposit	65,000,000.00
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	07/16/2025	Withdrawal	(35,000,000.00)
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	07/23/2025	Deposit	10,000,000.00
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	07/24/2025	Deposit	10,000,000.00
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	07/25/2025	Withdrawal	(80,000,000.00)
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	07/28/2025	Withdrawal	(50,000,000.00)
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	07/31/2025	Interest Received	835,968.07
	Activity Total			(774,164,031.93)
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity	07/01/2025	Withdrawal	(165,000,000.00)
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity	07/02/2025	Withdrawal	(10,000,000.00)
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity	07/31/2025	Interest Received	67,233.22
	Activity Total			(174,932,766.78)
0660P0999	Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct	07/31/2025	Interest Received	1,324,237.02
	Activity Total			1,324,237.02

Item 27

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)
Subject:	FW: City Attorney"s Office Budget Certification Letter
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 3:29:00 PM
Attachments:	CAT Budget Certification Letter - 8.11.25.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached Budget Certification letter from the Office of the City Attorney.

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: Zamora, Luis (CAT) <Luis.A.Zamora@sfcityatty.org>
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2025 12:23 PM
To: Mayor Daniel Lurie (MYR); Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Wagner, Greg (CON) <greg.wagner@sfgov.org>
Cc: Kittler, Sophia (MYR) <sophia.kittler@sfgov.org>; Allersma, Michelle (CON) <michelle.allersma@sfgov.org>; OKAI, DORA (CAT) <Dora.Okai@sfcityatty.org>; Macaulay, Devin (CON) <devin.macaulay@sfgov.org>; Hinton, Ken (CON) <ken.hinton@sfgov.org>
Subject: City Attorney's Office Budget Certification Letter

Good Afternoon,

Attached please find the City Attorney’s Office Budget Certification Letter for FY 2025-26 and 2026-27.

Best,

Luis A. Zamora (he/him)
Director of Community Relations and Executive Affairs
Office of City Attorney David Chiu
(415) 554-4748 Direct
www.sfcityattorney.org
Find us on: Facebook Twitter Instagram

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 notify me by telephone at (415) 554-4700, and delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

DAVID CHIU
邱信福
City Attorney

Direct Dial: (415) 554-4748
Email: Luis.A.Zamora@sfcityatty.org

August 11, 2025

Honorable Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244

Greg Wagner, Controller
City Hall, Room 316

Re: Adopted Budget for FY 2025-26 and FY 2026-27

I hereby certify, in conformance with San Francisco Charter Section 9.115 and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 3.14, that the funding provided in the adopted budget for Fiscal Year 2025-26 and Fiscal Year 2026-27 as adopted by the Board of Supervisors is adequate for my department to meet service levels as proposed to the Board.

Very truly yours,

David Chiu

DAVID CHIU
City Attorney

cc:
Sophia Kittler, Director of Mayor's Budget Director
Michelle Allersma, Director of Controller's Office of Budget and Analysis Division

Item 28

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: District Attorney Real Estate Fraud Report for FY 24-25
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 8:08:52 AM
Attachments:	Annual RE Report 2024-25.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached Real Estate Fraud Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2024-2025, submitted by the District Attorney's office.

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: Clendinen, Eugene (DAT) <eugene.clendinen@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 3:41 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: McCarthy, Matthew (DAT) <matthew.l.mccarthy@sfgov.org>; Gonzalez, Ana (DAT) <ana.gonzalez@sfgov.org>; NunesOber, Tina (DAT) <tina.nunesober@sfgov.org>; Arcelona, Sheila (DAT) <sheila.arcelona@sfgov.org>; Clendinen, Eugene (DAT) <eugene.clendinen@sfgov.org>; Robinson, Victoria (DAT) <victoria.robinson@sfgov.org>
Subject: District Attorney Real Estate Fraud Report for FY 24-25

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to Government Code § 27388, please find the San Francisco District Attorney's Office Real Estate Fraud Report for fiscal year 2024-2025. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks

Eugene Clendinen
He, His, Him
Chief, Finance and Administration
Office of District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
350 Rhode Island Street
North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct Phone: 628-652-4030
Main Line: 628-652-4000
Fax Number: 628-652-4001

BROOKE JENKINS
DISTRICT ATTORNEY
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

August 26, 2025

Board of Supervisors
City & County of San Francisco
Attn: Clerk Angela Calvillo
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Real Estate Fraud Annual Report pursuant to Government Code § 27388

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Enclosed, please find the San Francisco District Attorney's Office Real Estate Fraud Annual Report for fiscal year 2024-25. As required by Government Code § 27388, the District Attorney's Office is submitting this report to our local Board of Supervisors.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me @ Eugene.Clendinen@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

Eugene Clendinen
Chief, Administration and Finance

Crime Statistics Summary
- Name of Reporting County: **San Francisco**
- Reporting Fiscal Year Period: **July 1, 2024 - June 30, 2025**

Referrals
- Number of referrals entering in the fiscal year: **3**
- Number of referrals initiated during the fiscal year: **14**
- Total number of referrals: **17**

Investigations
- Number of investigations entering in the fiscal year: **3**
- Number of investigations initiated in the fiscal year: **7**
- Total number of investigations: **10**

Filed Cases
- Number of filed cases entering in the fiscal year: **2**
- Number of filed cases initiated in the fiscal year: **3**
- Total number of filed cases: **5**

Victims
- Number of victims in filed cases entering in the fiscal year: **4**
- Number of victims in filed cases initiated in the fiscal year: **7**
- Total number of victims in filed cases: **11**
- Number of convictions obtained in the fiscal year: **0**

- Aggregate monetary loss suffered by victims for filed cases entering in the fiscal year: **$671,000 + attorney's fees**
- Aggregate monetary loss suffered by victims for filed cases initiated during the fiscal year: **$1,289,000+ attorney's fees.**
- Aggregate monetary loss suffered by victims in cases in which there has been an investigation, filing, or conviction this fiscal year: **$8,339,000**

Real Estate Fraud Fund Financial Information

Fund balance as of July 1, 2024: **$82,130**
Fund balance as of June 30, 2025: **$121,352**

Investigative Costs - (Cost incurred on Real Estate cases but not charged to the fund)
- Total Cost: $41,419

Prosecution Costs – (Cost incurred on Real Estate cases but not charged to the fund)
- Total Cost: $157,270

Total Costs Incurred: $198,689

Contact Information

Name:	**Tina Nunes-Ober**
Title:	**Managing Attorney, Economic Crimes Unit**
Address:	**350 Rhode Island St., 2nd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103**
Office Email:	**tina.nunesober@sfgov.org**

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)
Subject:	FW: Issued – Airport Commission: SP Plus SF Joint Venture, in General, Adequately Reported and Remitted Parking Revenue, but Opportunities Exist to Improve the Oversight and Internal Controls at San Francisco International Airport Parking Facilities
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:23:00 PM
Attachments:	image004.png image005.png image006.png

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the link below for report form the Controllers City Services Auditor.

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: Reports, Controller (CON) <controller.reports@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 1:36 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: delaRosa, Mark (CON) <mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org>; Woo, Winnie (CON) <winnie.woo@sfgov.org>; Vo, Helen (CON) <helen.vo@sfgov.org>; Tam, Kristen (CON) <kristen.tam@sfgov.org>
Subject: Issued – Airport Commission: SP Plus SF Joint Venture, in General, Adequately Reported and Remitted Parking Revenue, but Opportunities Exist to Improve the Oversight and Internal Controls at San Francisco International Airport Parking Facilities

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to the San Francisco Charter, Section 3.105 and Appendix F, and Administrative Code, Chapter 10.6-2, the Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor today issued a report on its audit of the agreement between the City and County of San Francisco (City), through its Airport Commission (Airport), and SP Plus SF Joint Venture (SP Plus) for the operation and management of the parking facilities at San Francisco International Airport.

Please refer to the distribution e-mail below.

Office of the Controller

City & County of San Francisco

Alternate text

The Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) today issued a report on its audit of the agreement between the City and County of San Francisco (City), through its Airport Commission (Airport), and SP Plus SF Joint Venture (SP Plus) for the operation and management of the parking facilities at San Francisco International Airport. The audit found that SP Plus reported to the Airport $142,933,777 in operating revenues and $29,238,995 in expenses during the audit period. The audit concluded that SP Plus, in general, accurately deposited collected parking revenue and submitted supported expenses for reimbursement but identified some areas in which the Airport could improve its oversight of the garage's operations and better monitor SP Plus's compliance with the management agreement.

View the full report

Image

Sign up to receive news and updates

Search all Controller's Office reports

This is a send-only e-mail address.

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

For media queries, please contact Communications Manager Alyssa Sewlal at alyssa.sewlal@sfgov.org or (415) 694-3261.

Manage your preferences | Opt Out using TrueRemove™
Got this as a forward? Sign up to receive our future emails.
View this email online.

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place | San Francisco, CA 94102 US

This email was sent to controller.reports@sfgov.org.
To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.

City & County of San Francisco

SP Plus SF Joint Venture, in General, Adequately Reported and Remitted Parking Revenue, but Opportunities Exist to Improve the Oversight and Internal Controls at San Francisco International Airport Parking Facilities

Airport Commission

Prepared by

OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY SERVICES AUDITOR

August 5, 2025

About the Controller's Office

The Controller is the chief financial officer and auditor for the City and County of San Francisco. We produce regular reports on the City's financial condition, economic condition, and the performance of City government. We strive to be a model for good government and to make the City a better place to live and work.

About the Audits Division

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

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

Team:
Winnie Woo, *Audit Manager*

Consultant:
Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, Inc.

For more information, please contact:
Mark de la Rosa
Director of Audits
Office of the Controller
City and County of San Francisco
(415) 554-7574

Media inquiries:
con.media@sfgov.org
sf.gov/controller
@sfcontroller
Controller's Office LinkedIn

OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Greg Wagner
Controller

ChiaYu Ma
Deputy Controller

August 5, 2025

San Francisco Airport Commission
San Francisco International Airport
P.O. Box 8097
San Francisco, CA 94128-8097

Mike Nakornkhet, Airport Director
San Francisco International Airport
P.O. Box 8097
San Francisco, CA 94128-8097

Dear Commission President, Commissioners, and Director Nakornkhet:

The Office of the Controller (Controller), City Services Auditor (CSA), Audits Division, presents its report on the audit of the agreement between the City and County of San Francisco (City), through its Airport Commission (Airport), and SP Plus SF Joint Venture (SP Plus) for the operation and management of the parking facilities at San Francisco International Airport. CSA engaged Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, Inc., (SEC) to conduct the audit. The audit had as its objectives to determine whether SP Plus complied with the agreement and to assess the management and oversight of the agreement by the Airport.

Reporting Period: July 1, 2023, through June 30, 2024

Revenue: $142,933,777

Results:

SP Plus reported to the Airport $142,933,777 in operating revenues and $29,238,995 in expenses during the audit period. The audit found that SP Plus, in general, accurately deposited collected parking revenue and submitted supported expenses for reimbursement. However, the audit identified some areas in which Airport could improve its oversight of the garage's operations and better monitor SP Plus' compliance with the management agreement. The report includes 14 recommendations for the Airport to improve its oversight of the management agreement. The responses from the Airport and SP Plus are attached. CSA will work with the department to follow up every six months on the status of the open recommendations made in this report.

CSA and SEC appreciate the assistance and cooperation of the Airport and SP Plus staff involved in this audit. For questions about the report, please contact me at mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org or 415-554-5393 or CSA at 415-554-7469.

Respectfully,

Mark de la Rosa
Director of Audits

cc: Board of Supervisors
Budget Analyst
Citizens Audit Review Board
City Attorney
Civil Grand Jury
Mayor
Public Library

Airport Commission:
SP Plus SF Joint Venture, in General, Adequately Reported and Remitted Parking Revenue, but Opportunities Exist to Improve the Oversight and Internal Controls at San Francisco International Airport Parking Facilities

June 2025

SJOBERG EVASHENK CONSULTING, INC

455 Capitol Mall • Suite 700 • Sacramento, California • 95814 • Tel 916.443.1300 • Fax 916.443.1350

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the Audit

As authorized by the San Francisco Administrative Code, the Office of the Controller's City ServicesAuditor engaged Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, Inc., to assess whether SP Plus SF Joint Venture (SP Plus) complied with certain provisions in its parking facilities management agreement (management agreement) with the City and County of San Francisco to operate parking facilities at San Francisco International Airport, which is overseen by the City's Airport Commission (Airport). The audit also assessed whether the Airport appropriately oversaw the management agreement.

Highlights

In general, SP Plus accurately deposited collected parking revenue and submitted supported expenses for reimbursement. However, the audit identified the following areas that warrant improvement:

- The Airport provides millions of dollars annually in employee parking discounts, and the controls over discounts are easy to exploit, increasing the risk of fraud.
- Weaknesses in the parking permit management system and oversight practices may have contributed to missed revenue opportunities for the Airport:
  - The Airport provided United Airlines with 1,862 more parking permits than the number specified in its lease agreement, which may have potentially reduced revenue by an estimated $1.73 million for fiscal year 2023-24.
  - As of March 2025, approximately $326,000 in unpaid parking permit fees were more than 90 days past due, with some balances dating back to 2020. Further, late charges, estimated to exceed $5,000 per month, have not been applied to unpaid balances.
  - No process exists to reauthorize non-revenue generating parking permits, increasing the risk of potential misuse.
  - No process exists to reconcile records of parking permits with records of permit revenue collected, increasing the risk of uncollected revenue.
  - No process exists to document cancellation requests from permit holders.
- With a few minor exceptions, SP Plus' expenses were well-supported and in line with allowable expenses.

Recommendations

The report makes 14 recommendations for improvement, including the following key recommendations. The Airport should:

- Implement the planned daily parking discount price adjustments to decrease the discount provided.
- Consider the feasibility of moving to an automated or prepaid discount validation system, such as through the Aeroparker system, badge swipe, or license plate recognition.
- Conduct a review of historical parking permit allocations to determine the full extent of unauthorized usage without formal written agreement and assess the associated financial impact or update lease agreements to reflect agreed upon allocations.
- Develop a process to regularly provide tenant agreements to SP Plus and work with SP Plus to periodically ensure the parking privileges are aligned to tenant agreements.
- Establish parameters and criteria to standardize the initiation and escalation of collection efforts and activities and direct SP Plus to implement a late charge on delinquent accounts.
- Direct SP Plus to provide monthly accounts receivable aging reports to the Airport.
- Direct SP Plus to implement a formal process to periodically review and reauthorize non-revenue generating parking permits.
- Direct SP Plus to strengthen its review procedures to ensure that it submits to the Airport only eligible and contractually reimbursable expenses.

INTRODUCTION

Audit Authority

The City and County of San Francisco (City) has a parking facilities management agreement (management agreement) with SP Plus SF Joint Venture (SP Plus) for it to manage and operate parking facilities at San Francisco International Airport (SFO), which is overseen by the Airport Commission (Airport). The management agreement authorizes the City and its representatives to audit all accounts and records established under the management agreement. The San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 10.6-2, grants the Office of the Controller (Controller) the authority to audit departments to ensure they adequately manage their agreements for leased property. Also, the San Francisco Charter provides the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) with broad authority to conduct audits. CSA engaged Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, Inc., (SEC) to conduct the audit under these authorities.

Background

SFO has parking facilities that include multiple parking garages and lots, with nearly 16,000 public parking spaces and 7,000 employee parking spaces. The management agreement commenced on July 1, 2023, is set to expire on June 30, 2028, and has a not-to-exceed amount of $214,947,987.

The Airport's Parking Management Office (Airport Parking Management) oversees SP Plus's management and operation of the Airport's parking facilities. This office is responsible for reviewing parking revenue generation and reconciliations, approving budgets and operational expenses, and ensuring the operator adheres to the management agreement's terms. The management agreement requires SP Plus to:

- Collect all public parking fees and charges.
- Use the City's Parking Access and Revenue Control System (PARCS)[1] to provide reports and manage and operate the parking facilities.
- Distribute employee parking permits and collect all fees and charges associated with the employee parking program.
- Provide maintenance, janitorial, and security services for the parking facilities.
- Furnish, supervise, and train all management, technical, and administrative personnel who perform the required services.
- Provide services based on reimbursable costs plus a management fee.

[1] PARCS is a centrally managed system that controls garage access and tracks parking revenue. The Airport the purchased the system from Scheidt & Bachmann, who continue to support it.

The Airport has three main sources of parking revenue:

- "Drive-up" transient parking revenue, which is processed through the PARCS system.
- "Reservation" parking revenue, which is processed through the Aeroparker system.
- Parking permit revenue, which is processed through SP Plus' Central Accounts Receivable System (CARS).

SFO has four garages:

- Domestic Terminal Garage—one 5-level parking garage with 7 entry lanes and 16 exit lanes.
- International Terminal Garages A & G—two garages; a 9-level parking garage with 8 entry lanes and 6 exit lanes and another 9-level parking garage with 2 entry lanes and 7 exit lanes.
- Long-Term Parking Garage—one 7-level parking garage with 4 entry lanes and 5 exit lanes.

Objectives

The audit's purposes were to determine whether SP Plus complied with the management agreement and to assess the Airport's management and oversight of the management agreement. CSA and the Airport established the following specific audit objectives to assess:

How well SP Plus:

- Collects and safeguards parking revenue.
- Deposits parking revenue into an Airport bank account.
- Reconciles parking revenue between the bank and parking revenue system.
- Reports parking revenue to the Airport.
- Submits supported and eligible operational expenditures for reimbursement.

And how well the Airport:

- Reviews and approves the parking revenue reports it receives.
- Reviews and approves supported and eligible operational expenditures for reimbursement.

The audit objectives did not include any assessment of activities related to the City's agreement with Scheidt & Bachmann (S&B) for it to transmit data daily from PARCS to the Airport.

Scope and Methodology

The audit covered July 1, 2023, through June 30, 2024 (fiscal year 2023-24). To meet the audit objectives, we:

- Reviewed the applicable terms of the management agreement between the Airport and SP Plus.

- Assessed SP Plus's internal controls and procedures over collecting, reconciling, and reporting revenues and expenditures, including day-end close-out practices associated with verification of amounts collected and preparing the daily deposit.
- For July 2023, November 2023, and April 2024, traced "transient" (non-monthly) and monthly revenue collected and deposited to the Airport's bank account and determined whether expenses were accurately and appropriately billed to the Airport and were supported with sufficient documentation.
- Reviewed the employee parking permit process and processes to ensure all active permits had corresponding payments and permits are reauthorized appropriately.
- Identified the universe of all active parking permits for Airport and other city employees that were issued during the audit period and determined how much should have been collected based on the parking fees then in effect and number of active permits and compared to the amount remitted to the Airport.
- Selected a sample of parking permits (including both revenue-generating and non-revenue generating) to assess whether each permit had been approved and whether permits are deactivated in a timely manner.
- Reviewed the employee discount process and determined the number of employee discounts issued during the audit period.
- Of the $29.2 million in total expenses during the one-year audit period, selected three months of expenses totaling $8,856,223 or 30 percent of the total, to determine whether expenses SP Plus submitted to the Airport were appropriately supported for reimbursement and were allowable expenses according to the parking facilities management agreement. Specifically, tested September 2023 ($1,984,791), December 2023 ($3,029,531), and June 2024 ($3,841,901).

Statement of Auditing Standards

SEC conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that auditors plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for findings and conclusions based on the audit objectives. SEC believes that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

AUDIT RESULTS

Summary

In fiscal year 2023-24 SP Plus reported to the Airport total operating revenues of $143 million and expenses of $29 million. Exhibit 1 summarizes the operating revenues, expenses, and income of the Airport's parking operations in the audit period.

Exhibit 1. Airport Parking Operating Revenues, Expenses, and Income for July 1, 2023, Through June 30, 2024

Revenues	Expenses	Income (*Revenues Less Expenses)*
$142,933,777[2]	$29,238,995	$113,694,782

Source: Airport General Ledger

The audit found, in general, SP Plus accurately deposited collected parking revenue and submitted supported expenses for reimbursement. However, the following areas warrant improvement:

- The Airport provides millions of dollars annually in employee parking discounts, and the controls over discounts are easy to exploit, increasing the risk of fraud.
- Weaknesses in the parking permit management system and oversight practices may have contributed to missed revenue opportunities for the Airport.
    - The Airport provided United Airlines with 1,862 more parking permits than the number specified in its lease agreement, which may have potentially reduced revenue by an estimated $1.73 million in fiscal year 2023-24.
    - As of March 2025, approximately $326,000 in unpaid parking permit fees were more than 90 days past due, with some balances dating back to 2020. Further, late charges, estimated to exceed $5,000 per month, have not been applied to unpaid balances.
    - No process exists to reauthorize non-revenue generating parking permits, increasing the risk of potential misuse.

[2] This includes $130.0 million in parking revenue—$93.1 million in "drive-up" transient parking revenue and $36.9 million in "reservations" parking revenue—and $12.9 million in parking permit revenue. Parking revenue in Exhibit 1 excludes parking taxes paid.

- No process exists to reconcile records of parking permits with records of permit revenue collected, increasing the risk of uncollected revenue.

- No process exists to document cancellation requests from permit holders.

- With a few minor exceptions, SP Plus's expenses were well-supported and in line with allowable expenses.

Finding 1

The Airport Provides Millions of Dollars Annually in Employee Parking Discounts, and the Controls Over Discounts Area Are Easy to Exploit, Increasing the Risk of Fraud

During fiscal year 2023-24, the Airport's four garages generated $93 million in parking revenue through PARCS[3]. Of the four garages, Airport and city employees can park in the International Garages (A or G) for $13 per day, with a maximum stay of 30 days. The audit revealed that employee parking fees are significantly discounted at these two garages, reducing the Airport's revenue, and that controls surrounding the discount program are inadequate.

Airport and Other Government Employees Receive Significant Parking Discounts

SP Plus employees, Airport employees, City and County of San Francisco employees, and other government employees are eligible for a daily discount, which was $23 during the audit period. These employees paid a daily parking rate of $13 compared to the non-discounted rate of $36, a discount of 64 percent.

For the 12 days selected for detailed review, PARCS reports reflect that $691,195 in (non-reservation tickets) parking revenue was generated at the Airport's two International Terminal garages. The value of employee discounts given on these 12 days at these two garages was $241,720, or an average of more than $20,000 in employee discounts per day, as shown in Exhibit 2.

[3] Includes only PARCS daily drive-up parking revenue only; excludes $37 million in parking revenue generated through the Aeroparker reservation system, which travelers use to reserve and pre-pay for parking. PARCS generates tickets when individuals enter one of the Airport's parking garages**.** Upon exit, PARCS automatically calculates the parking fee based on the duration of the stay.

Exhibit 2. Value of Employee Discounts Given at International Terminal A and G Garages on 12 Days in Fiscal Year 2023-24

Date	Daily Parking Revenue[4]	Value of Employee Discounts	Percentage of Employee Parking Discounts to Revenue
7/14/2023	$138,614	$21,405	15.4%
7/15/2023	$64,820	$18,473	28.5%
7/16/2023	$72,280	$21,891	30.3%
7/17/2023	$70,702	$21,846	30.9%
11/17/2023	$107,810	$20,811	19.3%
11/18/2023	$55,816	$18,120	32.5%
11/19/2023	$63,088	$19,934	31.6%
11/20/2023	$51,120	$18,295	35.8%
4/27/2024	$60,356	$18,412	30.5%
4/28/2024	$62,404	$18,991	30.4%
4/29/2024	$62,748	$23,168	36.9%
4/30/2024	$129,244	$20,374	15.8%
Daily Average	**$78,250**	**$20,143**	**25.7%**

Based on this daily average, it appears likely that the Airport extended employee discounts totaling several millions at the two garages during fiscal year 2023-24.

Although the Airport generates substantial annual operational profits and aims to offer desirable benefits to employees, Airport Parking management recognized that the employee parking discount was overly generous and stated that the daily employee parking will be $20 per day effective July 1, 2025, reducing the discount from $23 to $16.

The Employee Parking Discount Program Is Inadequately Controlled, Which Increases the Risk of Fraud

To receive the employee discount, individuals present an Airport or other government employee badge or a wage statement to parking garage cashiers upon exit. According to SP Plus, cashiers must match an identification photo to the employee badge or wage statement to ensure it is for the appropriate individual. PARCS tracks the number of employee discounts given and cashiers maintain manual, handwritten logs that, in general, only reflect the employee badge number associated with a discount, but no other details such as employee name or department.

[4] Gross daily parking revenue, before employee discount adjustments.

The audit found that the processes employed to provide employee discounts can be easily circumvented and that the handwritten logs cashiers use to record that they verified a parker's eligibility for the employee discount are incomplete.

Specifically:

- Currently, there is no established mechanism to routinely verify the accuracy of information recorded in the parking discount logs. While SP Plus and the Airport rely on staff to enter information correctly, there is currently no process to systematically validate employee badge numbers, parker names, or ensure all entries are complete. As a result, there is a potential risk that inaccurate or incomplete data could go undetected, which may inadvertently allow ineligible discounts to be applied.

- Our review of records for one day, July 14, 2023, found that only 745 employee discount transactions were recorded in the logs although parking system records show 753 such transactions occurred that day. Thus, it appears that cashiers failed to log 8 of the employee discount parking transactions in one day.

- Employees can easily lend their badges to others, which could enable unauthorized use of employee discounts, especially if a cashier does not check the appearance of the parker against the photo on the badge or does not question the use of the badge by a person who does not resemble the photo. This is a control weakness that, if it were exploited, would undermine the purpose of the employee discount benefit and further contribute to forgone revenue.

- Cashiers could commit what would be a difficult-to-detect fraud by recording a full-cost parking transaction paid in cash as a discounted transaction (that is, applying an unauthorized discount) and pocketing the difference. As stated above, the $23 difference between the system-generated discounted fee, entered in the system by the cashier, and the full fee paid by a non-discount customer is significant. The cashier could try to legitimize such a fraudulent transaction by entering false information in the log or could simply not enter it in the log and, most likely, this omission would not be detected.

According to SFO Parking Management, the lack of robust controls is a result of temporary procedures implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic to minimize person-to-person contact. The lack of validation and oversight in the manual discount

process creates significant risks for abuse, revenue leakage, and operational inefficiency.

Recommendations

To increase potential revenue generation opportunities and improve controls over daily parking discounts, the Airport should direct SP Plus to:

1. Implement the planned daily parking discount price adjustments to decrease the discount provided.

2. Consider the feasibility of moving to an automated or prepaid discount validation system, such as through the Aeroparker system, badge swipe, or license plate recognition.

3. Make information collected and maintained in audit logs more robust and implement spot audits of logs and tracking tools for accuracy and transparency.

4. Train staff and establish clear disciplinary protocols to address potential misuse.

Finding 2

Weaknesses in the Parking Permit Management System and Oversight Practices May Have Contributed to Missed Revenue Opportunities for the Airport

In addition to the discounted daily parking fees discussed in Finding 1, the Airport offers quarterly parking permits to thousands of its employees and other authorized personnel. These permits—some of which generate revenue for the Airport and some of which are provided without charge—provide a cost-effective and convenient parking solution for those who regularly work at the San Francisco International Airport (SFO).

SP Plus receives parking permit applications from applicants and sends them to Airport Parking Management, which then reviews them to determine whether the permit will or will not generate revenue and, if approved, the permit is assigned a parking location. Upon approval by the Airport, SP Plus issues two types of parking permits:

- **Revenue-generating parking permits** are issued to the employees of airlines and other tenants operating at SFO. As of June 30, 2024, there were approximately 14,500 of these permits.

- **Non-revenue-generating parking permits** are issued to Airport employees, employees of the Airport's contractors, employees of certain tenants per the terms of their lease

agreements, and employees of various government entities, such as the Federal Aviation Administration. As of June 30, 2024, there were approximately 5,200 of these permits.

Holders of permits assigned to the Airport's parking garages receive garage access cards and those with permits assigned to the Airport's parking lots receive window decals.

The audit identified several issues related to both revenue- and non-revenue generating parking permit activities, stemming from a combination of the Airport providing insufficient guidance and oversight and SP Plus having inadequate controls and processes:

- The Airport provided United Airlines with 1,862 more parking permits than the number specified in its lease agreement, which may have potentially reduced revenue by an estimated $1.73 million in fiscal year 2023-24.

- As of March 2025, approximately $326,000 in unpaid parking permit fees were more than 90 days past due, with some balances dating back to 2020. Further, late charges, estimated to exceed $5,000 per month, have not been applied to unpaid balance.

- No process exists to reauthorize non-revenue generating parking permits, increasing the risk of potential misuse.

- No process exists to reconcile records of parking permits with records of permit revenue collected, increasing the risk of uncollected revenue.

- No process exists to document cancellation requests from permit holders.

The Airport provided United Airlines with 1,862 more parking permits than the number specified in its lease agreement, which may have potentially reduced revenue by an estimated $1.73 million in fiscal year 2023-24.

Per the 2013 modification of the Airport's lease agreement with United Airlines (United), 931 parking spaces were to be made available at no cost for use by United's employees. Despite this cap, and at the direction of Airport Parking Management, SP Plus provided 2,793 parking permits to the airline during fiscal year 2023-24, or 1,862 more than the agreement requires. Although Airport Parking Management could not verify the basis for the issuance of 2,793 parking permits, it acknowledged that it had

communicated this figure to SP Plus (thereby tacitly authorizing it).

Using an estimated average value of $232 per parking space per quarter, the 1,862 additional spaces represent approximately $432,000 in potential revenue per quarter or $1.73 million annually. This potential revenue is a significant financial impact that may warrant further review and corrective action. It is important to note that this estimate reflects only activity identified during the audit period; the actual revenue impact may be significantly higher if similar practices occurred in prior years.

The Airport Parking Management provided some historical records in an effort to support the variance between the number of parking permits actually issued and the amount stipulated in the agreement. This included a February 2000 letter indicating that the Airport had agreed to provide an additional 150 parking spaces. However, the letter did not clearly indicate whether the spaces were provided free of charge or subject to a set fee. According to Airport Management, it is unable to fully reconcile United Airlines' parking permits due to missing historical records. The Airport indicated that reviews and interviews are currently underway to obtain further clarification.

As of March 2025, approximately $326,000 in unpaid parking permit fees were more than 90 days past due, with some balances dating back to 2020. Further, late charges, estimated to exceed $5,000 per month, have not been applied to unpaid balance.

SP Plus establishes customer accounts with approved revenue-generating parking permits in the CARS billing system. Accounts are invoiced 45 days before the beginning of each quarter, and amounts due are pro-rated if activated during the middle of a billing cycle. SP Plus remits parking revenue to the Airport, including parking permit fees, twice a week**.** Exhibit 3 presents the parking permit fees in effect at SFO's parking locations during the audit period.

Exhibit 3. Parking Permit Fees

Parking Location	Quarterly Fee
Domestic Garages	$336
International Garages	$336
Lots C and D with/without bus service	$225 / $204
West Field Garages 1 and 2 with/without bus service	$225 / $204
Cargo Parking Lot	$204

Source: Airport memorandum to tenants regarding rates effective July 1, 2024

The audit found that neither the Airport nor SP Plus has processes to assess late charges or consistently enforce collection procedures.

SP Plus issues quarterly invoices to parking permit account holders, and the fees are due 15 days after the invoice date. However, according to SP Plus, when payments are late, Airport Parking Management does not require SP Plus to assess a late charge, so SP Plus does not do so. The management agreement does not require SP Plus to assess a late charge. According to Airport Parking Management, a 1.5 percent late charge was applied manually in the previous permit management system, but when the current system, PARCS, was implemented in the early 2000s, late charges were no longer assessed because of the system's limitations.

According to SP Plus, when its collection attempts fail, for example, when a company or individual does not make a reasonable effort to pay, it seeks guidance from Airport Parking Management on what the next steps should be, such as disabling the account's parking access card. However, it is entirely the discretion of SP Plus to determine when to notify Airport Parking Management about accounts it deems to be insufficiently responsive to its collection attempts. SP Plus acknowledged that it does not regularly provide accounts receivable aging reports to Airport Parking Management and does not have specific criteria that trigger advanced collection efforts to be initiated.

SP Plus's March 2025 accounts receivable aging report shows 25 accounts with a total of $325,862 in fees overdue by at least 90 days. Of the 25 accounts, 19 still had active permit cards, with some of these accounts showing outstanding balances dating back to 2023. The other 6 accounts were inactive, but the balances remained on the accounts receivable report and had not been collected or written off. According to SP Plus, companies began leaving the Airport in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and SP Plus left the outstanding fees in their accounts because it hoped that they would return and pay the past due amounts. SP Plus also indicated that strict accountability measures for past due accounts, such as disabling access cards, may be an operational hindrance if a large account becomes past due and hundreds of associated access cards are disabled.

Exhibit 4 shows the past due amounts for parking permits in March 2025. Had the 1.5 percent late charge been assessed on this amount, $5,439 in additional revenue could have been potentially generated in March 2025 alone.

Exhibit 4. Summary of March 2025 Parking Permit Aging Report

Payment Overdue (In days)	Amount
30-60 days	$28,407
60-90 days	$8,409
Over 90 days	$325,787
Total	**$362,603**
Potential Revenue with Late Fee Assessment (1.5%)	*$5,439*

Source: SP Plus Accounts Receivable Report

No Process Exists to Reauthorize Non-Revenue Generating Parking Permits, Increasing the Risk of Potential Misuse

In contrast to revenue-generating parking permits, which SP Plus reauthorizes upon receipt of payment, no formal process exists to periodically reauthorize non-revenue generating (without charge) permits to ensure their continued necessity and appropriateness. Rather, according to SP Plus, it automatically reauthorizes non-revenue generating accounts unless it is informed by the customer or Airport Parking Management that the passes are no longer required.

SP Plus stated that it deactivates the non-revenue generating permits linked to garage access cards if the cards remain unused for 30 days after the end of the calendar year, except for cards issued to Airport Commission employees. However, because permits are issued quarterly, only performing this check annually delays the identification of inactive or unauthorized permits. This means that a permit that goes unused in the first quarter could remain active for the entire year before being deactivated. Not promptly addressing permits that are no longer needed or valid could allow misuse of the Airport's parking resources and inaccurate permit records. Also, this annual check does not apply to permits associated with window decals.

The absence of a formal reauthorization control process increases the risk that the Airport may not collect parking revenue from individuals who no longer qualify for a permit. A permit that should have been deactivated could be fraudulently used for days, weeks, or months by a parker who no longer qualifies for it or, if the permit holder improperly lends or sells it, by others who never qualified for a permit.

No process exists to reconcile records of parking permits with records of permit revenue collected, increasing the risk of uncollected revenue.

Each month SP Plus reconciles records in the parking system and billing system to find any discrepancies in active parking permits, that is, parking permits present in one system but not the other. However, SP Plus does not reconcile the cost (amount that should have been paid) of each permit against the amount collected and deposited. A high-level comparison found no exceptions, but the lack of a paid-to-collected comparison in the process indicates that it is flawed and should be expanded. Not reconciling expected revenues to actual deposits increases the risk of unpaid fees and inaccurate revenue records, including undetected billing or payment discrepancies.

No Process Exists to Document Cancellation Requests From Permit Holders

The audit attempted to assess whether SP Plus promptly deactivated garage access cards associated with both revenue-generating and non-revenue generating parking permits after cancellation requests. However, we could not perform this analysis because of a lack of formal documentation. According to SP Plus, customers typically request cancellations via email or phone, but SP Plus has no formal process to record and track these requests. Without formal documentation of cancellation requests, there is no reliable audit trail to confirm whether SP Plus promptly deactivates garage access cards. This lack of oversight increases the risk of continued unauthorized access, misuse of parking privileges, and inaccurate permit records.

Recommendations

To improve parking permit management and revenue accountability, the Airport should:

5. Conduct a comprehensive review of historical parking permit allocations to determine the full extent of usage without formal written agreements and assess the associated financial impact or update lease agreements to reflect agreed upon allocations.

6. Develop a process to regularly provide tenant agreements to SP Plus and work with SP Plus to periodically ensure the parking privileges are aligned to tenant agreements.

7. Develop and implement formal policies and procedures that establish clear parameters and criteria to standardize the initiation and escalation of late payment collection efforts and related activities. The new policy should

include provisions for assessing the 1.5 percent late charge on delinquent accounts and when to write off uncollectible amounts.

8. Direct SP Plus to formally document all parking permit authorizations and regularly conduct reconciliations between approved and issued permits.

9. Direct SP Plus to provide monthly accounts receivable aging reports to the Airport.

10. Direct SP Plus to implement a formal process to periodically review and reauthorize all non-revenue generating parking permits. This process should include verification of continued eligibility and documented approval.

11. Direct SP Plus to enhance its reconciliation process by including a monthly comparison of the amounts due per permit with the amounts deposited.

12. Direct SP Plus to implement a formal process to document all cancellation requests, including the date of the request, method of submission, and date of deactivation.

Finding 3

With a Few Minor Exceptions, SP Plus' Expenses Were Well-Supported and in Line With Allowable Expenses

SP Plus's total actual expenses for managing the parking facilities in fiscal year 2023-24 were more than 10 percent less than the expenses budgeted in the contract, as shown in Exhibit 5.

Exhibit 5. Budget-to-Actual Expense Comparison, Fiscal Year 2023-24

Expense Category	Budget	Actual[5]	Difference
Payroll and Benefits	$24,983,940	$22,459,360	-10.1%
Operating Expenses	$2,444,188	$1,655,031	-32.3%
Insurance	$701,514	$701,514	0%
Management Fee	$296,004	$296,001	0%
Incentive Fee	$320,000	$136,566	-57.3%
Sub-Contracted Services	$3,937,052	$3,995,267	1.5%
Total	**$32,682,698**	**$29,243,739**	**-10.5%**

Source: Payroll and Benefits budget amounts from Airport variance reports; all other budget amounts from SP Plus management agreement; Actual amounts from SP Plus invoices

[5] Fiscal Year 2023-24 submitted invoices total $29,243,739, slightly more than the $29,238,995 reflected in the Airport's general ledger (Exhibit 1). The difference of $4,744 is due to a few expenses that the Airport disallowed.

In general, SP Plus's expenses were well-organized, well-supported, and consistent with the expenses allowed by the management agreement.

Some Ineligible Expenses Were Submitted to and Reimbursed by the Airport

SP Plus submitted and was reimbursed by the Airport for a total of $4,990 related to payroll services and express postal services, both of which are ineligible for reimbursement under the management agreement. In two of the three months tested, the Airport reimbursed SP Plus for payroll processing and express shipment fees, as shown in Exhibit 6.

Exhibit 6. SP Plus's Ineligible Expenses Reimbursed by the Airport In Sample Months

Sample Month	Payroll Services	Express Shipments	Total
September 2023	$1,845	$125	$1,970
December 2023	$2,888	$132	$3,020
Total	**$4,733**	**$257**	**$4,990**

As of March 2024 the Airport's Accounting Department identified the payroll processing expenses as ineligible and disallowed a total of $4,732 of these expenses in March, April, and May 2024. Although SP Plus did not submit any payroll services expenses after May 2024, it and Airport Parking Management agreed that payroll processing fees had been eligible for reimbursement in previous agreements and that the management agreement will be changed to again make these fees ineligible.

Similarly, the Airport reimbursed SP Plus a total of $257 for express shipment services, another ineligible expense category. As with the payroll processing fees, as of March 2024 the Airport's Accounting Department identified the express shipment expenses as ineligible and disallowed a total of $96 of these expenses in March, April, and May 2024.

Recommendations

To ensure all expenses SP Plus submits for reimbursement are supported and allowable under the management agreement, the Airport should:

13. Direct SP Plus to strengthen its review procedures to ensure that it submits to the Airport only eligible and contractually reimbursable expenses and ensure only eligible expenses are reimbursed.

14. Review all payroll and shipment expenses incurred before March 2024 and submitted under the current management agreement with SP Plus to determine whether SP Plus billed for these expenses and recover any amounts found to be incorrectly paid.

APPENDIX A: Airport Response

SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

July 15, 2025

Mr. Mark de la Rosa
Director of Audits
Office of the Controller - City Services Auditor
City Hall, Room 476
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

TRANSMITTED VIA EMAIL
mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org

Subject: Airport Parking Facilities Audit Period 7/1/2023 – 6/30/2024

Dear Mr. De la Rosa:

The Airport has reviewed the above-named audit and completed the attached Recommendation and Response Form. This letter is to confirm that, based upon the details provided, we agree with the audit results.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Alex Cheung at (650) 821-2851 or Anwar Elgonemy at (650) 821-5804.

Sincerely,

Mike Nakornkhet
Airport Director

Attachment

cc: Jeff Littlefield, Chief Operating Officer
Kevin Bumen, Chief Financial & Commercial Officer
Anwar Elgonemy, Director of Hotel, Parking, & Special Projects
Adam Gubser, Airport Parking Manager
Winnie Woo, Audit Manager, CSA

AIRPORT COMMISSION CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DANIEL LURIE MAYOR | **MALCOLM YEUNG** PRESIDENT | **JANE NATOLI** VICE PRESIDENT | **JOSE F. ALMANZA** | **MARK BUELL** | **SUSAN LEAL** | **MIKE NAKORNKHET** AIRPORT DIRECTOR
POST OFFICE BOX 8097 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94128 TEL 650.821.5000 FAX 650.821.5005 **FLYSFO.COM**

Recommendations and Responses

For each recommendation, the responsible agency should indicate in the column labeled Agency Response whether it concurs, does not concur, or partially concurs and provide a brief explanation. If it concurs with the recommendation, it should indicate the expected implementation date and implementation plan. If the responsible agency does not concur or partially concurs, it should provide an explanation and an alternate plan of action to address the identified issue.

Recommendation	Agency Response	CSA Use Only Status Determination*
The Airport should:		
1. Direct SP Plus to implement the planned daily parking discount price adjustments to decrease the discount provided.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur Implementation Date: Started Implementation Plan: Airport notification of the employee discount rate change from $13 to $20, set for distribution on July 18, 2025, with an activation date of August 1, 2025.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested
2. Direct SP Plus to consider the feasibility of moving to an automated or prepaid discount validation system, such as through the Aeroparker system, badge swipe, or license plate recognition.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur Implementation Date: Started Implementation Plan: Parking Management has instructed SP Plus to identify and recommend available systems that can automate employee discount validations by December 31, 2025.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested
3. Direct SP Plus to make information collected and maintained in audit logs more robust and implement spot audits of logs and tracking tools for accuracy and transparency.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur Implementation Start Date: August 1, 2025 Implementation Plan: Parking Management will direct SP Plus to enhance employee discount validation logs and implement periodic spot audits to ensure accuracy and transparency.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested

Recommendation	Agency Response	CSA Use Only Status Determination*
4. Train staff and establish clear disciplinary protocols to address potential misuse.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur Implementation Start Date: August 1, 2025 Implementation Plan: Parking Management will direct SP Plus to train staff and implement clear disciplinary procedures to address potential misuse of any employee discount validations.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested
5. Conduct a comprehensive review of historical parking permit allocations to determine the full extent of usage without formal written agreements and assess the associated financial impact or update lease agreements to reflect agreed upon allocations.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur Implementation Start Date: August 1, 2025 Implementation Plan: Parking Management will lead a comprehensive review of historical employee parking permit allocations in partnership with Aviation Management, Revenue Development and Management (RDM), and the Airport's Legal team. This effort will focus on identifying allocations issued without formal written agreements and reconciling them against known tenant entitlements. The Airport will also assess any associated financial impacts and determine whether lease agreements should be updated to reflect previously undocumented but operationally supported allocations.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested

Recommendation	Agency Response	CSA Use Only Status Determination*
6. Develop a process to regularly provide tenant agreements to SP Plus and work with SP Plus to periodically ensure the parking privileges are aligned to tenant agreements.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur Implementation Start Date: August 1, 2025 Implementation Plan: Parking Management will collaborate with Aviation Management, Revenue Development and Management (RDM), and the Airport's Legal team to develop a process for regularly sharing tenant agreements that include employee parking terms with SP Plus. This will be a new information-sharing practice designed to ensure that employee parking privileges are consistently aligned with active tenant agreements. Beginning August 1, 2025, Parking Management and SP Plus will conduct quarterly reviews of issued employee permits to validate alignment and document any updates or discrepancies in real time.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested
7. Develop and implement formal policies and procedures that establish clear parameters and criteria to standardize the initiation and escalation of late payment collection efforts and related activities. The new policy should include provisions for assessing the 1.5 percent late charge on delinquent accounts and when to write off uncollectible amounts.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur Implementation Date: Started Implementation Plan: Parking Management has instructed SP Plus to identify and recommend available systems that can automate late charge assessments associated with employee permit payments. Their current system does not support the collection of late fees. If no cost-effective solution is identified, SP Plus will be directed to implement a manual late fee process by December 31, 2025, at no additional cost to the Airport.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested

Recommendation	Agency Response	CSA Use Only Status Determination*
8. Direct SP Plus to formally document all parking permit authorizations and regularly conduct reconciliations between approved and issued permits.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur Implementation Start Date: August 1, 2025 Implementation Plan: Parking Management will direct SP Plus to formally document all employee parking permit authorizations and regularly conduct reconciliations between approved and issued permits.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested
9. Direct SP Plus to provide monthly accounts receivable aging reports to the Airport.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur Implementation Start Date: August 1, 2025 Implementation Plan: We will request the monthly accounts receivable aging report from SP Plus. The assigned analyst will review the report for any aged or unusual transactions and escalate relevant items to management for further review.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested
10. Direct SP Plus to implement a formal process to periodically review and reauthorize all non-revenue generating parking permits. This process should include verification of continued eligibility and documented approval.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur Implementation Start Date: August 1, 2025 Implementation Plan: Parking Management will direct SP Plus to implement a formal process for periodic review and reauthorization of all non-revenue generating employee parking permits, which should include verification of continued eligibility and documented approval.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested

Recommendation	Agency Response	CSA Use Only Status Determination*
11. Direct SP Plus to enhance its reconciliation process by including a monthly comparison of the amounts due per permit with the amounts deposited.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur Implementation Start Date: August 1, 2025 Implementation Plan: Parking Management will direct SP Plus to perform monthly reconciliations comparing amounts due versus amounts deposited for employee parking permits.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested
12. Direct SP Plus to implement a formal process to document all cancellation requests, including the date of the request, method of submission, and date of deactivation.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur Implementation Start Date: August 1, 2025 Implementation Plan: Parking Management will direct SP Plus to implement a formal process to document all employee parking permit cancellation requests, including the date of the request, method of submission, and date of deactivation.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested
13. Direct SP Plus to strengthen its review procedures to ensure that it submits to the Airport only eligible and contractually reimbursable expenses and ensure only eligible expenses are reimbursed.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur Implementation Start Date: August 1, 2025 Implementation Plan: Parking Management will direct SP Plus to strengthen its expense review procedures to ensure that only eligible and contractually reimbursable expenses and submitted and reimbursed.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested
14. Review all payroll and shipment expenses incurred before March 2024 and submitted under the current management agreement with SP Plus to determine whether SP Plus billed for these expenses and recover any amounts found to be incorrectly paid.	☒ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☐ Partially Concur We will review expenses incurred prior to March 2024 to ensure they align with the most recent contract modification.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested

APPENDIX B: SP Plus SF Joint Venture Response

SP+ | SF Parking

July 24, 2025

Mr. Mark de la Rosa
Director of Audits
Office of the Controller - City Services Auditor
City Hall, Room 476
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: Performance Audit Report – SP Plus SF Parking for the Period July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024

Dear Mr. de la Rosa,

I have received and reviewed the draft Performance Audit Report for SP Plus SF Parking, which Lynda McCallum sent via email on July 21, 2025.

I am writing to confirm that I agree with the audit results based on the details provided in the report.

Please feel free to call me at (415) 470-1764 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Rachel Young

Rachel Young | SP+ | A Metropolis Company | General Manager
Mobile: 415.470.1764 | www.spplus.com | www.metropolis.io

Item 30

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: State Legislation Committee Bill Positions Memo 8/27/25
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 12:05:08 PM
Attachments:	08.18.25 Minutes.pdf (EM Signed) SLC Bill Positions Memo 8.27.2025.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached approved positions before the California State Legislature from the State Legislation Committee meeting of August 27, 2025.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
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: Zhang, Adrianna (MYR - Contractor) <adrianna.zhang@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 12:00 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mariano, Eileen (MYR) <eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org>
Subject: State Legislation Committee Bill Positions Memo 8/27/25

Hello,

Attached is the State Legislation Committee Bill Position Memo and Minutes from the

8/27/2025 meeting. Thanks.

Best,
Adrianna

Adrianna Zhang
Intern – State & Federal Affairs
Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
adrianna.zhang@sfgov.org

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 AUG 27 PM 12:51

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: Eileen Mariano, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
RE: State Legislation Committee Bill Positions (August 27, 2025 Meeting)
DATE: Wednesday, August 27, 2025

Dear Madam Clerk:

Please be advised that the State Legislation Committee approved the following positions on legislation pending before the California State Legislature:

AB/SB	Bill #	Author(s)	Title	Adopted Position
SB	716	Durazo	Lifeline program: broadband internet access service.	Support

Present at the meeting were representatives from the Mayor's Office, Board President Rafael Mandelman's Office, the City Attorney's Office, the Assessor's Office, the Controller's Office, and the Treasurer's Office. In addition, please find attached the approved minutes from the July 30, 2025 meeting.

Should the Board of Supervisors wish to find more information on these matters, they may do so at the following link: http://sfgov.org/slc/.

Sincerely,

Eileen Mariano

Eileen Mariano
Manager of State and Federal Affairs

STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 27, 2025
10:00am – 12:00pm
City Hall, Room 288

OVERVIEW

This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above. Members of the public may view the meeting by reviewing the details below, with the video link, phone number, and other related information provided:

- **Meeting ID:** 2663 705 7838
- **Meeting Password:** XmSWi3mh4Y2
- **Join by Phone at:** +1-415-655-0001 (Please dial "#" after entering the Meeting ID to view the meeting)
- **Link:** https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m8ab6a7f9b96224c6dd2e6b92be48a61d
- **Public Comment:** Please review instructions on page 4.

MEMBERS

Mayor's Office (Chair) -- Eileen Mariano
Supervisor Connie Chan's Office -- Frances Hsieh
Board President Rafael Mandelman's Office – Brad Phelps
Assessor's Office -- Holly Lung
City Attorney's Office -- Rebekah Krell
Controller's Office – Greyson Spencer
Treasurer's Office – Eric Manke

AGENDA

Meeting commenced at 10:06am.

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Eileen Mariano, Brad Phelps, Rebekah Krell, Holly Lung, Greyson Spencer, and Eric Manke.

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item). Discussion and possible

action to approve the minutes from the meeting on July 30, 2025.

Motion to Approve: Brad Phelps
Seconded by: Holly Lung
Approved: 6-0

III. STATE LOBBYIST OVERVIEW AND UPDATE (Discussion Item). The City's state lobbyist will present to the Committee an update on State legislative matters.

IV. PROPOSED LEGISLATION (Discussion and Action). Discussion and possible action item: the Committee will review and discuss state legislation affecting the City and County of San Francisco. Items are listed by Department, then by bill number.

New Business

San Francisco Department of Technology
Presenter: Jeremy Pollock

SB 716 (Durazo): Lifeline program: broadband internet access service.
Recommended Position: Support

The Department of Technology (DT) recommends a SUPPORT position on SB 716 as currently drafted (7/17/25), which would add stand-alone broadband Internet service to the California LifeLine program. This would enable low-income households to receive a monthly subsidy of up to $30/month for qualifying home Internet service (at least 100/20 Mbps). Participating ISPs would be eligible for up to $19/month/subscriber in funding from the California Lifeline program and $9.25/month/subscriber from the federal component of the program. SB 716 also removes the historic barrier that ISPs receive "Eligible Telecommunications Carrier" (ETC) certification from the CPUC, reducing a major regulatory barrier to participation from local governments and other entities. SB 716 would authorize the CPUC to implement the program, which would sunset in 2032.

Motion to Approve: Eric Manke
Seconded by: Brad Phelps
Approved: 6-0

V. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT. Members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the Committee's subject matter jurisdiction and that do not appear on the agenda.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 10:24am.

Disability Access

Room 201 of City Hall is located at 1 Dr. Carton B. Goodlett Place and is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible Muni lines serving this location are: #47 Van Ness, and the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness, as well as Muni Metro stations at Van Ness and Civic Center. For more information about Muni accessible services, call 923-6142. There is accessible parking at the Civic Center Plaza garage.

The State Legislation Committee does not permit remote public comment by members of the public its meetings, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings. If you require remote access as a means of reasonable accommodation under ADA, please contact the State Legislation Committee to request remote access, including a description of the functional limitation(s) that precludes your ability to attend in person. Requests made at least two business days in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability. For further assistance, please contact Joshua Cardenas, Mayor's Office, at: joshua.cardenas@sfgov.org.

Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance

The government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions 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 Donna Hall at Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, by phone at 415-554-7724, by fax at 415-554-7854, or email the Sunshine Ordinance Taskforce Administrator at sotf@sfgov.org. Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by contacting the Task Force, or by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at www.sfgov.org/sunshine.htm.

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 Sec. 2.100 –2.160) 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 415-581-2300, fax 415-581-2317, Internet website: www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Cell Phones and Pagers

The ringing 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 a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

Public Comment

Public Comment will be taken in-person on each item on the agenda before or during consideration of that item.

- To view the meeting via computer systems:
  https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m6681835cd6480991d3922332297f1336
  NOTE: Depending on your broadband/WIFI connection, there may be a 30-second to 2-minute delay when viewing the meeting live.

- To view the meeting via phone:
  - **Join by Phone at**: +1-415-655-0001
  - **Webinar ID:** 2669 222 6780
  - **NOTE:** Once you join the meeting via the number above, enter the webinar ID and then press # to enter the meeting.

Information Regarding Providing Public Comment

Each individual may comment 1 time per agenda item.
Each individual may speak for up to 2 minutes; after which time the line is automatically silenced.

Documents that may have been provided to members of the State Legislation Committee in connection with the items on the agenda include proposed state legislation, consultant reports, correspondence and reports from City departments, and public correspondence. These may be inspected by contacting Eileen Mariano, Manager, State and Federal Affairs, Mayor's Office at: eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org.

Health Considerations

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

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); Entezari, Mehran (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Status of the San Francisco Economy: July 2025
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 3:03:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png

From: Reports, Controller (CON) <controller.reports@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, August 8, 2025 9:24 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Subject: Status of the San Francisco Economy: July 2025

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

The Office of Economic Analysis of the Controller's Office, today issued its bi-monthly report, "Status of the San Francisco Economy: July 2025," as general information.

Please refer to the distribution email below.

Office of the Controller
City & County of San Francisco

Alternate text

Highlights of the July Report

- San Francisco's downtown recovery has continued throughout the summer, even as the macroeconomic context becomes more challenging, and there are few signs of sustained growth in hiring in the labor market.
- Downtown foot traffic indicators continued to recover from May to July, for both employees and visitors. Downtown BART ridership continued its recovery as well, though MUNI Metro Ridership dipped in June.
- Housing – especially rental housing – is emerging as a bright spot in the city's recovery. According to Apartment List, San Francisco has experienced the fastest rent growth in the country over the past 12 months, although asking rents here still remain below pre-pandemic levels.
- Housing permits also spiked over the May-July period. While permits are a volatile indicator and the spike was due to only two larger projects, it is a potential sign of recovery.

View the full report

Sign up to receive news and updates

Search all Controller's Office reports

This is a send-only email address.

For questions about the report, please contact Chief Economist Ted Egan. Ph.D. at ted.egan@sfgov.org.

For press queries, please contact Communications Manager Alyssa Sewlal at alyssa.sewlal@sfgov.org or (415) 694-3261.

Manage your preferences | Opt Out using TrueRemove™
Got this as a forward? Sign up to receive our future emails.
View this email online.

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place | San Francisco, CA 94102 US

This email was sent to asim.khan@sfgov.org.
To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.

Status of the San Francisco Economy: July 2025

Office of the Controller

Office of Economic Analysis

August 8, 2025

Highlights of the July Report

- San Francisco's downtown recovery has continued throughout the summer, even as the macroeconomic context becomes more challenging, and there are few signs of sustained growth in hiring in the labor market.
- Downtown foot traffic indicators continued to recover from May to July, for both employees and visitors. Downtown BART ridership continued its recovery as well, though MUNI Metro Ridership dipped in June.
- Housing – especially rental housing – is emerging as a bright spot in the city's recovery. According to Apartment List, San Francisco has experienced the fastest rent growth in the country over the past 12 months, although asking rents here still remain below pre-pandemic levels.
- Housing permits also spiked over the May-July period. While permits are a volatile indicator and the spike was due to only two larger projects, it is a potential sign of recovery.

List of Indictors

1. Industry Employment, San Francisco Metro Division
2. Employment Change by Industry Sector
3. Unemployment Rate, San Francisco and California
4. Indeed Job Postings Index
5. Downtown Employee and Visitor Visits
6. Office Attendance Recovery
7. Office Vacancy and Asking Rents
8. New Business Registration, Selected Sectors
9. Hotel Occupancy Rate & Average Daily Rate
10. Hotel Revenue Available per Room Night: Selected Cities Comparison
11. Muni Metro Ridership Recovery
12. BART Exits at Downtown SF Stations
13. Bay Bridge and Golden Bridge Traffic
14. San Francisco PM Freeway Speeds
15. Apartment Asking Rent
16. Housing Prices
17. Authorized Housing Units

Job Gains Since April Are Mainly Seasonal



Source: EDD, SF Metro Division includes San Francisco and San Mateo counties.

Seasonal Gains in Tourism & Construction; Drops in Education



Source: EDD, SF Metro Division includes San Francisco and San Mateo counties.

Unemployment Rate Jumped in June



Source: EDD. Seasonal adjustment for San Francisco by the San Francisco Controller's Office.

Most Metro Job Markets, Including SF, See Softer Job Listings



Source: Indeed

Downtown Foot Traffic Recovery Continuing



Source: Source: Placer.ai, courtesy of the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department.

Metro SF's Office Attendance Steady At ~40% of 2019 Levels



Source: Kastle System

Office Vacancy Continuing to Rise, Slowly



Source: Jones Lang LaSalle (JLL)

Little Trend in New Business Registration Activity



Source: Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector

Slight Drop in Hotel Occupancy & Rates Since Mid-June



Source: STR

But Hotel Revenues Generally Trending Up Through June



Source: STR

June a Soft Month for MUNI Metro Ridership



Source: SFMTA

Downtown BART Exits Reached Post-Pandemic High in June



Source: BART

Bridge Volumes Remain Stable



Source: Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA), Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation District. Includes westbound Bay Bridge and southbound Golden Gate Bridge traffic.

Falling Freeway Speeds Indicate Rising Congestion



Source: SF County Transportation Authority

Local Apartment Rents Up 10% Year-over-Year



Source: Apartment List

Though Local and State Home Prices Are Trending Down



Source: Zillow

Housing Permits Spiked in June and July



Source: San Francisco Planning Department

Staff Contacts

Ted Egan, Ph.D., Chief Economist

ted.egan@sfgov.org

Asim Khan, Ph.D., Senior Economist

asim.khan@sfgov.org

Item 32

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)
Subject:	CA Fish and Game Commission - 9 letters
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 11:53:02 AM
Attachments:	CA Fish and Game Commission 9 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 9 letters, from the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting notices regarding golden mussel, invasive non-native mussels and green crab, to commercial bull kelp harvest restrictions, commercial coonstripe shrimp fishery, recreational take of rockfish, cabezon, greenling, and lingcod, recreational crab fishing gear and commercial passenger fishing vessel (CPFV) validation, the take of Morro manzanita, recreational striped bass harvest size limits, and the agenda for the August 13-14, 2025 California Fish and Game Commission meeting.

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: California Fish and Game Commission
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations - Recreational Striped Bass Harvest Size Limits
Date: Wednesday, July 30, 2025 9:32:59 AM

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

View as a webpage / share

California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations

Greetings,

A notice of proposed changes in regulations related to recreational striped bass harvest size limits has been posted to the Commission's website. The notice and associated documents can be accessed at: https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2025-New-and-Proposed#5-75

Sincerely,

David Haug
California Fish and Game Commission

Click here to visit our regulations page

Not signed up to receive our informative emails?

Sign Up

Do not reply to this message. FGC@public.govdelivery.com is for outgoing messages only.

California Fish and Game Commission
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:
Manage Subscriptions | Help

This email was sent to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Commissioners
Erika Zavaleta, President
Santa Cruz
Samantha Murray, Vice President
La Jolla
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Member
McKinleyville
Eric Sklar, Member
Saint Helena
Darius W. Anderson, Member
Kenwood

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Gavin Newsom, Governor

Fish and Game Commission

Melissa Miller-Henson
Executive Director
P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
(916) 653-4899
fgc@fgc.ca.gov

www.fgc.ca.gov

Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870

August 27, 2025

Notice of Proposed Emergency Action

Emergency Action to Readopt Amendments to Section 671, Title 14
California Code of Regulations
Re: Add Golden Mussel to the List of Restricted Animals

Pursuant to the requirements of California Government Code (GOV) Section 11346.1, the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) is providing notice of proposed emergency action with regard to the above-entitled emergency regulation.

Submission of Comments

GOV Section 11346.1 subdivision (a)(2) requires that, at least five working days prior to submission of the proposed emergency action to the California Office of Administrative Law (OAL), the adopting agency provide a notice of the proposed emergency action to every person who has filed a request for notice of regulatory action with the agency. After submission of the proposed emergency to OAL, OAL shall allow interested persons five calendar days to submit comments on the proposed emergency regulations as set forth in GOV Section 11349.6.

Any interested person may present statements, arguments, or contentions, in writing, submitted via U.S. mail or e-mail, relevant to the proposed emergency regulatory action. Written comments submitted via U.S. mail or e-mail must be received at OAL within five days after the Commission submits the emergency regulations to OAL for review.

Please reference submitted comments as regarding “Restricted Animals: Golden Mussel” addressed to:

Reference Attorney
Office of Administrative Law
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 1250
Sacramento, CA 95814

E-mail: staff@oal.ca.gov
Fax No.: 916-323-6826

California Fish and Game Commission
Attn: Sherrie Fonbuena
P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090

Email: fgc@fgc.ca.gov
Fax No.: n/a

Notice of Emergency Action
Restricted Animals: Golden Mussel
August 27, 2025

This emergency action was authorized by the Commission at its June 11-12, 2025 meeting. The Commission anticipates it will submit the rulemaking to OAL between September 4 and 8, 2025. For the status of the Commission's submittal to OAL for review, and the end of the five-day written submittal period, please consult OAL's website at http://www.oal.ca.gov under the heading “Emergency Regulations.”

From: California Fish and Game Commission
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Notice of Proposed Regulations - Take of Morro Manzanita
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 9:59:07 AM

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

View as a webpage / share

Image of California Redwoods

California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Proposed Regulations

Greetings,

A notice of proposed regulations regarding the take of Morro manzanita has been posted to the Commission's website. The notice and associated documents can be accessed at: https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2025-New-and-Proposed#749.14.

Sincerely,

Jenn Bacon
California Fish and Game Commission

Click here to visit our regulations page

Not signed up to receive our informative emails?

Sign Up

Do not reply to this message. FGC@public.govdelivery.com is for outgoing messages only.

California Fish and Game Commission
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:
Manage Subscriptions | Help

This email was sent to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

TITLE 14. Fish and Game Commission
Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by sections 2118 and 2120 of the California Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific sections 1002, 2116, 2118, 2118.2, 2118.4, 2119, 2120, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2150, 2190 and 2271 of said Code, proposes to amend Section 671, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, to add invasive non-native mussels and green crab to the list of live restricted animals.

Unless otherwise specified, all section references in this document are to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Commission refers to the California Fish and Game Commission and Department refers to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Current regulations in Section 671 contain the list of restricted species that are unlawful for any person to import, transport, or possess except as authorized in a permit issued by the Department. Under emergency regulatory authority, golden mussel (*Limnoperna fortunei*) was added to the list of restricted animals in December 2024 (Office of Administrative Law File Number 2024-1213-03E).

The proposed changes will add green crab (*Carcinus maenas*), an invasive, non-native crustacean species, and the *Limnoperna*, *Sinanodonta* and *Xenostrobus* genera which are invasive, non-native bivalve species, to the list of restricted animals consistent with California Fish and Game Code sections 2118 and 2120.

Background

Green Crab (*C. maenas*)

The green crab (*C. maenas*), also known as the European green crab, native to the northeast Atlantic Ocean and northern Africa, is an invasive non-native species in California.

Green crab was first detected in California in 1989 in the southern San Francisco Bay. It is suspected that the green crab arrived in seaweed-wrapped bait shipments from the East Coast of the U.S. Since then, green crab has been identified in many California bays and estuaries including, but not limited to, San Francisco Bay and Bay Delta, Elkhorn Slough, Bolinas Lagoon, Bodega Bay, Tomales Bay, Morro Bay and Humboldt Bay. There is concern that green crab can continue to expand beyond currently established populations in California and cause extensive damage to recreational and commercial fishery resources, aquaculture, native fisheries, and sensitive habitat.

On July 7, 2017, the Commission received a petition for regulatory change (Petition 2017-006) from Mr. Joshua Russo, President of the Watermen's Alliance, requesting that regulations be adopted to list green crab as an invasive aquatic species. The Department evaluated the petition and provided a recommendation to the Commission to grant the petition.

At its April 2018 meeting, the Commission agreed with the Department's recommendation and granted the petition for consideration in a future rulemaking.

Golden Mussel (genus *Limnoperna*)

On October 17, 2024, golden mussel (*L. fortunei*), an invasive, freshwater bivalve native to rivers and creeks of China and Southeast Asia, was discovered in the Port of Stockton by California Department of Water Resources (DWR) staff while conducting routine operations. This was the first known occurrence of this highly invasive species in North America. Additional discoveries of golden mussel have occurred throughout the Delta and interconnected waters, including the lower reach of the San Joaquin River (San Joaquin County), and at several points in the California Aqueduct including, from north-to-south, Bethany Reservoir (Alameda County), O'Neill Forebay (Merced County), Dos Amigos Pumping Plant (Merced County), Pleasant Valley Pumping Plant (Fresno County), Las Perillas Pumping Plant on the Coastal Branch Aqueduct (Kings County), and Check 24 (Kings County). Without actions to prevent further spread, golden mussel is also likely to spread overland on trailered watercraft and equipment out of the Delta and to nearby and distant fresh and brackish waters, including rivers, lakes, and reservoirs within California and the rest of North America.

Golden mussel is known to be established outside of its native range in Hong Kong, Japan, Taiwan, Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Argentina. Impacts in these invaded regions include heavy encrustations of golden mussels forming dense reef-like structures that block municipal and industrial water supplies, agricultural irrigation, and power plant operations, necessitating ongoing biofouling removal. In most cases, the invaded range has expanded upstream from the point of introduction, and inland from ports through local, human-mediated pathways. Within the invaded range, significant impacts resulting from the dense colonization of golden mussels on hard surfaces are widely documented.

At its December 11, 2024 meeting, the Commission approved an emergency rulemaking to add golden mussel (*L. fortunei*) to the list of restricted animals in Section 671 (Office of Administrative Law File Number 2024-1213-03E). The proposed rulemaking will serve as the certificate of compliance for the addition of *L. fortunei* to the list of restricted animals.

Beyond the immediate threat of *L. fortunei*, the other five species within the genus *Limnoperna* mussels have the potential to be inadvertently introduced to California, and likely to have similar negative impacts to California as *L. fortunei*. Other species within the genus *Limnoperna* include *L. siamensis*, *L. ngocngai*, *L. bogani*, *L. sambasensis*, and L. taprobanensis. *Limnoperna* mussels are native to Asia, primarily Southeast Asia. Most *Limnoperna* species can be found in freshwater to estuarine habitats, although it is hypothesized that *L. taprobanensis* is a marine species.

Outside of *L. fortunei*, there are few records of invasions outside of their native ranges by other species of *Limnoperna*; however, available literature indicates they may have similar biology and impacts as *L. fortunei*.

Pond Mussels (genus *Sinanodonta*)

Pond mussels (*Sinanodonta*) (also known as Asian pond mussels) are freshwater unionid bivalves of 26 species that are fast-growing and can reach high densities. Species within *Sinanodonta* are difficult to morphologically identify, which has led to extensive misidentification of species. Additionally, the molecular taxonomy within the genus is still being resolved.

Native to Eastern Asia including China and eastern Russia, Japan and Korea, three species of *Sinanodonta* (*S. woodiana*, *S. lauta*, and S. pacifica) have been documented to be invasive outside of their native ranges and have spread rapidly to other countries including Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Iran, South Korea, Myanmar, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Borneo, Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, Spain, France, Italy, Germany, Austria, Slovakia, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Poland, Croatia, Serbia, Romania, Moldova, Belgium, Ukraine and Sweden.

In 2010, *S. woodiana* was detected for the first time in the United States within aquaculture ponds in Franklin Township, New Jersey. Pond mussel has not been detected in California, or any other U.S. state with the exception of New Jersey.

Based on the establishment of *S. woodiana* in North America, potential vectors of introduction, and anticipated impacts to native species and the environment, prohibiting all species in the genus *Sinanodonta* is warranted.

Axe-Head Mussel (genus *Xenostrobus*)

Axe-head mussel (*Xenostrobus securis*), a small, non-native, invasive, biofouling brackish water bivalve, was discovered on December 6, 2024, just north of the Port of Long Beach and Port of Los Angeles in the lower reaches of Dominguez Channel, Los Angeles County. This detection was made by Department staff conducting early detection monitoring for invasive mussels. This is the first known occurrence of the invasive species in North America. Shortly after, axe-head mussels were detected in high densities at additional sites including the lower reaches of San Gabriel River (February 21, 2025) and Los Angeles River (February 27, 2025).

Axe-head mussel is one of eight extant species of the genus *Xenostrobus*. These species include *X. pulex* and *X. securis* from Australia and New Zealand, *X. inconstans* from Australia, *X. balani*, *X. mangle* and *X. sambasensis* from Southeast Asia, *X. hepatica* from Fiji, and *X. atratus* from Japan, Korea, and China. Axe-head mussel (X. securis) has been introduced and established outside of its native ranges in Japan, China, Korea, Hong Kong, Italy, France, and Spain.

Globally axe-head mussel was likely introduced by ballast water discharge and biofouling on ships. Without containment, axe-head mussel is likely to spread via watercraft in the marine environment to other estuaries, brackish waters, and ports of California, other U.S. states and territories, and internationally, and overland on trailered vessels and equipment in North America.

Beyond the immediate threat of axe-head mussel, the other seven species of *Xenostrobus* mussels have the potential to be inadvertently introduced to California, and are likely to have similar negative impacts to California as axe-head mussel.

Proposed Changes

The proposed regulations add green crab, and the *Limnoperna*, *Sinanodonta*, and *Xenostrobus* genera to the list of live animals restricted from importation, transportation and possession:

Section 671. Importation, Transportation and Possession of Live Restricted Animals.

Amend subsection (c)(8) from Class Crustacea to Class Malacostraca to update and correct the Class for the species in this subsection. The Class Crustacea has been reclassified by The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to a higher level and is now a subphylum of the phylum Arthropoda.

Add subsection (c)(8)(C) *Carcinus maenas* (green crab) (D).

Adding green crab, which causes harm to native species and the ecosystems they depend on to survive, to the list of restricted animals is necessary to protect against the spread of this invasive species in California. Prohibiting importation, transportation, and possession of this species will prevent further introductions and slow the spread within and outside of California.

Amend subsection (c)(10) Class Bivalvia-Bivalves to move “All members of the genus *Dreissena* (zebra and quagga mussels) (D).” under subsection (A) to allow for the addition of other species under this class.

Add subsection (c)(10)(B) All members of the genus *Limnoperna* (golden mussel) (D).

Adding all members of the genus *Limnoperna* (golden mussel), which can cause harm to native species and the ecosystems they depend on to survive, as well as infrastructure, to the list of restricted animals is necessary to protect against the spread of these invasive species in California. Prohibiting importation, transportation, and possession of the species will prevent further introductions and slow the spread within and outside of California.

Add subsection (c)(10)(C) All members of the genus *Sinanodonta* (pond mussel, Asian pond mussel) (D).

Adding all members of the genus *Sinanodonta* (pond mussel), which can cause harm to native species and the ecosystems they depend on to survive, to the list of restricted animals is necessary to protect against the spread of these invasive species in California. Prohibiting importation, transportation, and possession of the species will prevent further introductions and slow the spread within and outside of California.

Add subsection (c)(10)(D) All members of the genus *Xenostrobus* (axe-head mussel) (D).

Adding all members of the genus *Xenostrobus* (axe-head mussel), which can cause harm to native species and the ecosystems they depend on to survive, as well as infrastructure, to the list of restricted animals is necessary to protect against the spread of these invasive species in California. Prohibiting importation, transportation, and possession of the species will prevent further introductions and slow the spread within and outside of California.

Benefits of the Regulation:

The California Legislature has declared that some wild animals are a threat to native wildlife or the agricultural interests of the state and that some wild animals are a threat to public health and safety. It is the Legislature’s intention that the importation, transportation and possession of wild animals be

regulated to protect the native wildlife and agricultural interests of the state against damage from the existence at large of certain wild animals and to protect the health and safety in this state. The proposed regulations will help to prevent the new introductions of species within the *Limnoperna*, *Sinanodonta*, and *Xenostrobus* genera to waterbodies of the state and the translocation of green crab, and members of the *Limnoperna* and *Xenostrobus* genera to other waterbodies in the state and beyond, thereby protecting native wildlife, the agricultural interests of the state and public health and safety.

Consistency and Compatibility with Existing Regulations

Article IV, Section 20 of the California Constitution specifies that the Legislature may delegate to Commission such powers relating to the protection and propagation of fish and game as the Legislature sees fit. The Legislature has delegated to the Commission the power to regulate the importation, transportation and possession of wild animals to protect the native wildlife, agricultural interests of the state, and the health and safety in this state (California Fish and Game Code Section 2118). The Commission has reviewed its own regulations and finds that the proposed regulations are consistent with other regulations in Title 14, CCR, and therefore finds that the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. The Commission has searched the California Code of Regulations and finds no other state agency regulations pertaining to species on the list of restricted animals.

Public Participation

Comments Submitted by Mail or Email

It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before September 26, 2025 at the address given below, or by email to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Written comments mailed, or emailed to the Commission office, must be received before 12:00 noon on October 7, 2025. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address. Mailed comments should be addressed to Fish and Game Commission, PO Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090.

Meetings

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the East End Complex Auditorium, 1500 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, California, which will commence at 8:00 a.m. on October 8, 2025 and may continue at 8:00 a.m., on October 9, 2025. The Commission will make a reasonable effort to provide the public additional opportunities to observe or provide comment in the meeting through the Zoom videoconference platform by computer, mobile device, or telephone connections. However, the Commission cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of the remote connection options. Should technical issues affect remote attendee access or quality, an attempt will be made to resolve them, but the meeting will continue with in-person attendees. Instructions for participation in the webinar/teleconference hearing will be posted at www.fgc.ca.gov in advance of the meeting or may be obtained by calling 916-653-4899. Please refer to the Commission meeting agenda, which will be available at least 10 days prior to the meeting, for the most current information.

Availability of Documents

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Action, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the text of the regulation in underline and strikeout format can be accessed through the Commission website at www.fgc.ca.gov. The regulations as well as all related documents upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, Melissa Miller-Henson, Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 715 P Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above-mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to Melissa Miller-Henson or Sherrie Fonbuena at FGC@fgc.ca.gov or at the preceding address or phone number. **Environmental Program Manager, Martha Volkoff, Department of Fish and Wildlife, who can be reached at Invasives@wildlife.ca.gov, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.**

Availability of Modified Text

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

Impact of Regulatory Action/Results of the Economic Impact Assessment

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

(a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Business, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The proposed regulations are not expected to impact businesses, as adding a species to the list of restricted animals in Section 671 does not impose any actions that should be taken by businesses to comply, nor does it impose fees or fines upon them. Because these effects are economically neutral, it is not anticipated that any businesses will experience adverse economic impacts that would affect their ability to compete with businesses from other states as a result of these regulations.

(b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California; Benefits of the Regulation to the Health and Welfare of California Residents, Worker Safety, and the State's Environment:

The proposed regulations are not expected to impact businesses, as adding a species to the list of restricted animals in Section 671 does not necessitate that any actions should be taken by businesses to comply, nor does it impose fees or fines upon them. Because these effects are economically neutral, it is not anticipated that any businesses will experience adverse economic impacts that would affect the creation or elimination of jobs within the state, create new businesses or eliminate existing businesses, affect the expansion of existing businesses, or benefit worker safety as a result of these regulations. The proposed changes are sought to protect native wildlife and the agricultural interests of the state and public health and welfare and the state's environment.

The Commission anticipates benefits to the health and welfare of California residents from better protection of the state's natural resources. The proposed regulations will help to prevent the introduction and/or translocation of members of the *Limnoperna* (golden mussel), *Sinanodonta* and *Xenostrobus* genera to other waterbodies in the state and beyond, which may help to protect water conveyance and hydroelectric power systems.

The Commission anticipates benefits of the regulation to the state's environment. The California Legislature has declared that some wild animals are a threat to native wildlife or the agricultural interests of the state and that some wild animals are a threat to public health and safety. It is the Legislature's intention that the importation, transportation and possession of wild animals be regulated to protect the native wildlife and agricultural interests of the state against damage from the existence at large of certain wild animals and to protect the health and safety in this state. The proposed regulations will help to prevent the new introductions of species within the *Limnoperna*, *Sinanodonta*, and *Xenostrobus* genera to waterbodies of the state and the translocation of green crab, and members of the *Limnoperna* and *Xenostrobus* genera to other waterbodies in the state and beyond, thereby protecting native wildlife, and the agricultural interests of the state.

(c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The Commission is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

The proposed regulations are not expected to create direct cost impacts for businesses or individuals, as adding a species to the list of restricted animals in Section 671 does not necessitate that any actions should be taken by businesses or individuals to comply, nor does it impose fees or fines upon them.

(d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

Including the species and genera proposed on the list of restricted animals does not necessarily compel a requirement to act upon state agencies, but rather enables existing

programs to include the species in their enforcement actions for detection and prevention. As such, the Commission does not anticipate any direct costs or savings to the Department or other state agencies as a result of this action. There may be future complementary authorities or requirements for managing the species proposed that will come from elsewhere, such as legislation, compelling costs associated with preventing the spread of these invasive species.

(e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies:

None.

(f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts:

None.

(g) Costs Imposed on any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code:

None.

(h) Effect on Housing Costs:

None.

(i) Business Reporting Requirements:

The proposed action does not impose a business reporting requirement.

Effect on Small Business

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business. The Commission has drafted the regulations in Plain English pursuant to Government Code Sections 11342.580 and 11346.2(a)(1).

Consideration of Alternatives

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Melissa Miller-Henson
Executive Director

Dated**:** August 12, 2025

From: California Fish and Game Commission
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Revised California Fish and Game Commission meeting agenda
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 3:53:18 PM

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

View as a webpage / share

Image of California Redwoods

California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Revised August Meeting Agenda

Greetings,

The agenda for the August 13-14, 2025 California Fish and Game Commission has been revised in four ways:

- Updated information about joining the meeting remotely, with and without providing public comment.
- Moved what was Agenda Item 21 (experimental fishing permit major amendment request) to become the new Agenda Item 17 under consent, and renumber what were items 17-20 accordingly.
- The descriptions for what is now 18C (Referred petitions), Agenda Item 23A (Tribal Committee), and Agenda Item 23B (Marine Resources Committee) have been refined.
- Added information regarding the re-opening of recreational razor clam fishing in Del Norte County by the Department director under item 23C.

Please refer to the agenda for important meeting information and deadlines.

Sincerely,

Melissa Miller-Henson
Executive Director
California Fish and Game Commission

Click Here for Meeting Agenda

Not signed up to receive our informative emails?

Sign Up

Do not reply to this message. FGC@public.govdelivery.com is for outgoing messages only.

California Fish and Game Commission
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:
Manage Subscriptions | Help

This email was sent to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Commissioners
Erika Zavaleta, President
Santa Cruz
Samantha Murray, Vice President
La Jolla
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Member
McKinleyville
Eric Sklar, Member
Saint Helena
Darius W. Anderson, Member
Kenwood

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Gavin Newsom, Governor

Fish and Game Commission

Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870

Melissa A. Miller-Henson
Executive Director
P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
(916) 653-4899
fgc@fgc.ca.gov

www.fgc.ca.gov

Revised* Meeting Agenda
August 13-14, 2025

California Natural Resources Headquarters Building
715 P Street, Second Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Join us in person in Sacramento to provide public comment or observe the meeting.

Options for Remote Public Comment via Zoom or Phone

To join the meeting remotely:

- Via Zoom (video and audio): Click directly on the meeting link at https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87226185009.
- Via Phone (audio-only): For detailed instructions on how to join by phone, please refer to Option 3 in the remote access instructions.
- Remote Access Instructions: You can access instructions for joining by phone or Zoom by clicking here or visit the Commission meetings page at fgc.ca.gov/meetings/2025.

The Commission will make a reasonable effort to provide the public additional opportunities to observe or provide comment in the meeting through the Zoom videoconference platform by computer, mobile device, or telephone connections. However, the Commission cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of the remote connection options. Should technical issues affect remote attendee access or quality, an attempt will be made to resolve them, but the meeting will continue with in-person attendees.

Option for Remote Observation Without Public Comment

To watch or listen only, on the day of the meeting visit http://www.fgc.ca.gov (link is on the right side of the page). The Commission will make a reasonable effort to live-stream the meeting to allow the public to observe the meeting from a remote location without providing comments. However, the Commission cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of the webcast.

***This agenda has been revised in four ways:**

- **Updated information about joining the meeting remotely, with and without providing public comment.**

- **Moved what was Agenda Item 21 (experimental fishing permit major amendment request) to become the new Agenda Item 17 under consent, and renumber what were items 17-20 accordingly.**
- **The descriptions for what is now 18C (Referred petitions), Agenda Item 23A (Tribal Committee), and Agenda Item 23B (Marine Resources Committee) have been refined.**
- **Added information regarding the re-opening of recreational razor clam fishing in Del Norte County by the Department director under item 23C.**

Notes: (1) See important meeting deadlines and procedures, including written public comment deadlines, starting on page 12.

(2) A list of reports or other significant documents received by the commission since its June 2025 meeting is on page 7.

(3) Unless otherwise indicated, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife is identified as Department.

(4) All section and subsection references are to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), unless otherwise noted.

August 13, 2025; 9:00 AM

Call to order and roll call to establish a quorum

1. Consider approving agenda and order of items

General Public Comment

2. General public comment for items not on the agenda

Receive public comment regarding topics within the Commission's authority that are not included on either day of the August 13-14, 2025 agenda.

Note: The Commission may not discuss or take action on any matter raised during this item, except to decide whether to place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting (sections 11125 and 11125.7(a), California Government Code).

Consent Items

Note: Items on the consent calendar are expected to be routine and non-controversial. After any public comment, the Commission will consider approving items on the consent calendar in a single vote without discussion. The presiding commissioner may choose to remove any item from the consent calendar and allow a separate discussion and potential action on that item in response to a request by a Commission member, staff, or an interested person.

3. Five-year private lands wildlife habitat enhancement and management area (PLM) plan and license (consent)

Consider approving corrections to PLM plan and 2025-2029 license for Roostercomb Ranch (Stanislaus County).
(Pursuant to Section 601)

4. White sturgeon sport fishing 2084 regular rulemaking (consent)
Consider adopting proposed amendments to regulations for the recreational take of, tagging of, and reporting requirements for, white sturgeon (*Acipenser transmontanus*) in inland and ocean waters, pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Section 2084 and consider taking final action under the California Environmental Quality Act.
(Repeal sections 5.78, 5.79, 27.92, 27.93 and 27.95; and amend sections 1.74, 5.80, 5.81, 27.60, 27.90, 27.91 and 701)

5. Regulation change petitions (wildlife and inland fisheries) (consent)
(Pursuant to Section 662)

(A) ***Petitions for action today***
Consider whether to grant, deny, or refer for additional review, petitions for regulation change received at previous meetings. Petitions granted today will be added to the rulemaking calendar for development and future consideration.

I. *Petition 2022-02: Request to create a new class of deer hunting tags restricted to specified methods of take such as traditional archery and muzzleloading*

II. *Petition 2025-04: Request to allow the purchase of a second bear tag*

(B) ***New petitions***
Receive new petitions for regulation change.

Consideration of new petitions (whether to grant, deny, or refer for additional review) is expected to be scheduled for the October 8-9, 2025 Commission meeting.

(C) ***Referred petitions***
Receive comments on petitions previously referred by the Commission to staff, legal counsel, a Commission committee, or the Department for review and recommendation.

Commission action on any referred petition will be scheduled for consideration once a recommendation is received.

6. Non-regulatory requests from previous meetings (wildlife and inland fisheries) (consent)
Consider and potentially act on non-regulatory requests submitted by members of the public at previous meetings.

Discussion and Action Items

7. Commission executive director and Department reports

(A) ***Commission executive director***

(B) ***Department director and Law Enforcement Division***

8. Western Joshua Tree Conservation Plan
Discuss and consider approving the revised draft *Western Joshua Tree Conservation Plan*.
(Pursuant to subdivision 1927.6(a), California Fish and Game Code)

9. Quino checkerspot butterfly

Consider and potentially act on the petition, the Department's evaluation report, and comments received to determine whether listing Quino checkerspot butterfly (*Euphydryas editha quino*) as an endangered species under the California Endangered Species Act may be warranted.
(Pursuant to sections 2074 and 2074.2, California Fish and Game Code)

10. Bogg's Lake hedge-hyssop

Receive a presentation from the Department on the five-year status review for Bogg's Lake hedge-hyssop (*Gratiola heterosepala*).
(Pursuant to Section 2077)

11. Morro manzanita take provision

Discuss proposed regulation regarding take of Morro manzanita while a candidate species under the California Endangered Species Act, pursuant to Section 2084 of the California Fish and Game Code.
(Add Section 749.14)

12. Invasive non-native mussels (including golden, pond, and axe-head mussels) and green crab

Consider authorizing publication of notice of intent to amend regulations adding invasive non-native mussels of the *Limnoperna* (including golden mussel), *Sinanodonta* (pond mussels) and *Xenostrobus* (axe-head mussels) genera, and green crab (*Carcinus maenas*), to the list of live animals restricted from importation, transportation and possession.
(Amend Section 671)

13. Recreational take of striped bass

Discuss proposed amendments to regulations regarding recreational striped bass harvest size limits.
(Amend sections 5.75 and 27.85)

14. Committee and Department reports

(A) ***Wildlife Resources Committee***

Discuss referred topics and consider revisions to topics and timing. Consider approving draft agenda topics for the next committee meeting to be held September 11, 2025.

(B) ***Department Wildlife and Fisheries Division, and Department Ecosystem Conservation Division***

Receive updates from Department divisions on items of note since the previous Commission meeting.

Recess

August 14, 2025; 8:30 AM

Call to order and roll call to establish a quorum

Consent Items

Note: Items on the consent calendar are expected to be routine and non-controversial. After any public comment, the Commission will consider approving items on the consent calendar in a single vote without discussion. The presiding commissioner may choose to remove any item from the consent calendar and allow a separate discussion and potential action on that item in response to a request by a Commission member, staff, or an interested person.

15. Commercial take of coonstripe shrimp emergency (consent)
Consider adopting a 90-day extension of emergency regulations related to the commercial take of coonstripe shrimp.
(Amend Section 180.15)

16. Market squid (consent)

(A) ***Market Squid Fishery Management Plan***
Consider approving proposed amendments to the draft amended *Market Squid Fishery Management Plan*.
(Pursuant to sections 7075, 7077 and 7078, California Fish and Game Code)

(B) ***Commercial take of market squid***
Consider adopting proposed amendments to regulations for commercial take of market squid.
(Amend sections 53.01, 149 and 149.1; repeal sections 53.02 and 53.03).

17. Experimental fishing permit (EFP) major amendment request (consent)
Receive, consider, and act upon a major amendment request to an EFP (Commission tracking ID #2022-01) approved to test deep-set buoy gear and night-set buoy gear to target swordfish and other highly migratory species fisheries.
(Pursuant to Section 91) I

18. Regulation change petitions (marine) (consent)
(Pursuant to Section 662)

(A) ***Petitions for action today***
Consider whether to grant, deny, or refer for additional review, petitions for regulation change received at previous meetings. Petitions granted today will be added to the Commission's rulemaking calendar for development and future consideration.

I. *Petition 2025-05: Request to allow filleting of striped bass on commercial passenger fishing vessels*

II. *Petition 2025-06: Request to restrict the use of trap gear in the commercial coonstripe shrimp fishery*

III. *Petition 2025-07: Request to remove recreational crab trap validation requirements for anglers under the age of 16*

(B) ***New petitions***
Receive new petitions for regulation change.

Consideration of new petitions (whether to grant, deny, or refer petitions for additional review) is expected to be scheduled for the October 8-9, 2025 Commission meeting.

(C) ***Referred petitions***
Receive public comments on petitions previously referred by the Commission to staff, legal counsel, a Commission committee, and/or the Department for review and recommendation.

Commission action on any referred petition will be scheduled for discussion and consideration once a recommendation is received.

The Commission is not expected to discuss individual MPA (marine protected area) petitions at this meeting. General MPA comments not specific to petitions, will be received under Agenda Item 25 (general public comment for items not on the agenda).

Comments related to the proposed MPA petitions evaluation framework, and the potential grouping of petitioned actions for future review and discussion, will be received under Agenda Item 23B (Marine Resources Committee).

Discussion and Action Items

19. Recreational take of rockfish, cabezon, greenling, and lingcod emergency
Consider adopting emergency regulations to reopen recreational rockfish, cabezon, greenling, and lingcod fisheries in state waters.
(Amend sections 1.91, 27.25, 27.30, 27.35, 27.40 and 28.55)

20. Commercial bull kelp harvest restrictions
Consider authorizing publication of notice of intent to amend regulations regarding temporary commercial bull kelp harvest restrictions along the north coast and the closure of lease-only administrative kelp beds 308, 309, and 312 until January 1, 2029.
(Amend sections 165 and 165.5)

21. Recreational red abalone closure extension
Consider authorizing publication of notice of intent to amend regulations to extend the temporary red abalone recreational fishery closure until April 1, 2036, extending the "sunset" date by ten years.
(Amend Section 29.15)

22. Recreational crab fishing gear and commercial passenger fishing vessel trap validation
Consider authorizing staff to provide public notice of sufficiently related changes to, and consider adopting, proposed amendments to regulations for recreational crab fishing gear and commercial passenger fishing vessel trap validation.
(Amend sections 29.80, 29.85, 190, 195 and 701)

23. Committee and Department reports

Staff will recommend that this item be heard immediately before Agenda Item 19.

(A) ***Tribal Committee***
Receive summary and consider approving recommendations from the August 12, 2025 committee meeting, including committee perspectives on MPA petitions review and how tribally-focused MPA petitions are identified. Discuss referred topics and consider revisions to topics and timing.

(B) ***Marine Resources Committee***
Receive summary and consider approving recommendations from the July 16-17, 2025 committee meeting, including the proposed MPA petitions evaluation framework and potential grouping of petitioned actions for future review and evaluation discussion. Discuss referred topics and consider revisions to topics and timing.

(C) ***Department Marine Region***
Receive updates on items of note since the previous Commission meeting.

I. *Pacific sardine*

Action taken by the Department director to lift the recreational and commercial take restrictions for Pacific sardine south of Point Conception to the U.S./Mexico border after notification that a health risk no longer exists.
(Pursuant to subdivision 5523(b)(2), California Fish and Game Code)

II. *Razor clam*

Action taken by the Department director to reopen the recreational razor clam fishery in Del Norte County after health agencies determined that razor clams from this area no longer pose a significant health threat for domoic acid exposure.
(Pursuant to subdivision 5523(b)(2), California Fish and Game Code)
(Note: The bivalve shellfish health advisory for elevated levels of paralytic shellfish poisoning toxins remains in effect in Del Norte County.)

24. Commission administrative items

(A) ***Legislative report***
Receive updates on state and federal legislation and regulatory activity, and consider providing direction to staff on potential actions.

(B) ***Rulemaking timetable updates***
Review and consider approving changes to the perpetual timetable for anticipated regulatory actions.

(C) ***Potential meeting dates for 2027***
Consider and potentially approve revised draft meeting dates for 2027 as proposed by staff; staff will confirm locations at a future meeting.

(D) ***Future meetings and new business***
Review logistics and approve draft agenda items for the next Commission meeting (October 8-9, 2025), consider any changes to approved meeting dates or locations, or introduce new business for a future meeting agenda.

25. General public comment for items not on the agenda

Receive public comment regarding topics within the Commission's authority that are not included on either day of the August 13-14, 2025 agenda.

Note: The Commission may not discuss or take action on any matter raised during this item, except to decide whether to place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting (Section 11125 and subdivision 11125.7(a), California Government Code).

Adjourn

Public Receipt of Documents

This section of the agenda highlights reports or other significant documents received by the Commission since the previous meeting. Any Commission discussion or action on these documents will be noticed and placed on the agenda of a future meeting. Since June 14, 2025, the Commission has received two documents:

1. Department's evaluation report on the petition to list Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) as threatened or endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA); consideration of whether the petitioned action may be warranted is scheduled for October 2025. Additional information about the petition is available on the Commission's CESA page under "Active Petitions" at https://fgc.ca.gov/CESA.
2. Department's evaluation report on the petition to list Gerry's curly-leaved monardella (*Monardella sinuate* subsp. *gerryi*) as endangered under CESA; consideration of whether the petitioned action may be warranted is scheduled for October 2025. Additional information about the petition is available on the Commission's CESA page under "Active Petitions" at https://fgc.ca.gov/CESA.

Executive Session

(Not open to the public)

At a convenient time during the regular agenda of its June 11-12, 2025 meeting, the Commission will recess from the public portion of the agenda and conduct a closed session on the agenda items below. The Commission is authorized to discuss these matters in a closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 11126, subdivisions (a)(1), (c)(3), and (e)(1), and Fish and Game Code Section 309. After closed session, the Commission will reconvene in public session, which may include announcements about actions taken during closed session.

(A) Pending litigation to which the Commission is a party

I. United Water Conservation District v. California Fish and Game Commission (challenge to final Southern California steelhead CESA listing decision).

II. The People of the State of California v. Hannam Chain U.S.A., Inc., et al. (restricted species) and Hannam Chain U.S.A., Inc., et al. v. California Fish and Game Commission (challenge to restricted species regulation)

III. The Ballona Wetlands Land Trust v. California Fish and Game Commission and California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (challenge to decisions related to public uses on an ecological reserve)

IV. The Ballona Wetlands Land Trust v. California Fish and Game Commission (Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve petition for regulation change)

V. Borba et al. v. Merced Co, Merced Irrigation Dist., California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, and California Fish and Game Commission (complaint for damages related to flooding)

VI. Perez-Ramirez et al. v. County of Merced, City of Merced, Merced Irrigation Dist., California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, and California Fish and Game Commission (complaint for damages related to flooding)

VII. Glenn et al. v. County of Merced, City of Merced, Merced Irrigation Dist., California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, and California Fish and Game Commission (complaint for damages related to flooding)

(B) Possible litigation involving the Commission

(C) Staffing

(D) Deliberation and action on license and permit items

California Fish and Game Commission
Meeting Schedule

Note: As meeting dates and locations can change, please visit www.fgc.ca.gov for the most current list of meeting dates and locations. All Commission meetings will include a webinar/teleconference option for attendance and every effort will be made to ensure that committee meetings include the same.

Meeting Date	Commission Meeting	Committee Meeting
September 11, 2025		**Wildlife Resources** California Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor Sacramento, CA 95814
October 8-9, 2025	Sacramento	
November 5-6, 2025		**Marine Resources** Sacramento area
December 9, 2025		**Tribal** California Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor Sacramento, CA 95814
December 10-11, 2025	Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor (2-302 A/B) Sacramento, CA 95814	
January 13, 2026		**Wildlife Resources** Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor (2-302 A/B) Sacramento, CA 95814
February 11-12, 2026	Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor (2-221 A/B/C) Sacramento, CA 95814	
March 12, 2026		**Marine Resources** Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor (2-221 A/B/C) Sacramento, CA 95814
April 14, 2026		**Tribal** Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor (2-201, Media) Sacramento, CA 95814

Meeting Date	Commission Meeting	Committee Meeting
May 6, 2026	Teleconference Sacramento (2-201, Media), Trinidad, Sonoma, Santa Cruz, and La Jolla	
May 14, 2026		**Wildlife Resources** Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor (2-221 A/B/C) Sacramento, CA 95814
June 17-18, 2026	Sacramento area	

Other Meetings of Interest

Meetings listed here are organizations for which the Commission: (1) is a member, or (2) takes action based upon regulations developed by that organization.

Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

- September 21-24, 2025 – Tucson, AZ
- September 13-16, 2026 – Lancaster, PA

Pacific Fishery Management Council

- September 18-24, 2025 – Spokane, WA
- November 13-19, 2025 – Costa Mesa, CA
- March 4-10, 2026 – San Francisco, CA
- April 7-13, 2026 – Portland, OR
- June 11-17, 2026 – Spokane, WA
- September 17-23, 2026 – Vancouver, WA
- November 13-19, 2026 – Orange County, CA

Pacific Flyway Council

- September 12, 2025 – Provo, UT
- March 2026 – Date and location TBD
- August or September 2026 – Date and location TBD

Wildlife Conservation Board

- August 28, 2025 – Sacramento, CA
- November 20, 2025 – Sacramento, CA
- February 2026 – Sacramento, CA
- May 2026 – Sacramento, CA
- August 2026 – Sacramento, CA
- November 2026 – Sacramento, CA

Important Commission Meeting Procedures Information

Welcome to a Meeting of the California Fish and Game Commission

This year marks the 156th year of operation of the Commission in partnership with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Our goal is the preservation of our heritage and conservation of our natural resources through informed decision making; Commission meetings are vital in achieving that goal and we provide this information to be as effective and efficient toward that end. Welcome, and please let us know if you have any questions.

Persons with Disabilities

Persons with disabilities needing reasonable accommodation to participate in public meetings or other Commission activities are invited to contact the Department's Civil Rights Office (CRO) at civilrights@wildlife.ca.gov. Accommodation requests for facility and/or meeting accessibility and requests for American Sign Language interpreters should be submitted at least two weeks prior to the event. Requests for real-time captioners should be submitted at least four weeks prior to the event. These timeframes are to help ensure that the requested accommodation is met. If a request for an accommodation has been submitted but is no longer needed, please contact the CRO immediately.

Stay Informed

To receive meeting agendas and regulatory notices about those subjects of interest to you, visit the Commission's website, www.fgc.ca.gov, to sign up on our electronic mailing lists.

Submitting Written Comments

The public is encouraged to comment on any agenda item. Submit written comments by one of the following methods: E-mail to fgc@fgc.ca.gov; mail to California Fish and Game Commission, P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090; deliver to California Fish and Game Commission, 715 P Street, 16th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814 (you must call at least one business day in advance to arrange delivery). Materials provided to the Commission may be made available to the general public.

Comment Deadlines

The ***Comment Deadline*** for this meeting is **5:00 p.m. on July 31, 2025**. Written comments received at the Commission office by this deadline will be made available to Commissioners prior to the meeting.

The ***Supplemental Comment Deadline*** for this meeting is **noon on August 8, 2025**. Comments received by this deadline will be made available to Commissioners at the meeting.

After these deadlines, written comments may be delivered in person to the meeting. Please bring 12 copies of written comments to the meeting and give them to the designated staff member just prior to speaking.

Petitions for Regulation Change

Any person requesting that the Commission adopt, amend, or repeal a regulation must complete and submit form FGC 1, *Petition to the California Fish and Game Commission for Regulation Change* (as required by Section 662, Title 14, CCR), available at https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/Petition-for-Regulation-Change. To be received by the

Commission at this meeting, petition forms must be received by the ***Supplemental Comment Deadline*** or delivered in person at the meeting during the regulation change petitions agenda item. Petitions received at this meeting will be scheduled for consideration at the next regularly scheduled business meeting, unless the petition is rejected under staff review pursuant to subsection 662(b), Title 14, CCR.

Non-Regulatory Requests

All non-regulatory requests follow a two-meeting cycle to ensure proper review and thorough consideration of each item. All requests submitted by the ***Supplemental Comment Deadline*** (or heard during general public comment at the meeting) will be scheduled for receipt at this meeting and scheduled for consideration at the next regularly scheduled business meeting.

Speaking at the Meeting

To speak on an agenda item in-person**,** please complete a "speaker card" and provide it to the designated staff member before the agenda item is announced. Please complete one speaker card per item. Cards will be available near the entrance of the meeting room.

To speak on an agenda item via Zoom or phone*,* please "raise" your hand either through the Zoom function or by pressing *9 once on your phone when prompted at the beginning of the agenda item.

1. In-person speakers will be identified in groups; please line up when your name is called. Speakers on Zoom or phone will be identified by your Zoom display name or the last three digits of your phone number; listen closely for when your name or number is called.
2. When addressing the Commission, please give your name and the name of any organization you represent, and provide your comments on the item under consideration.
3. If there are several speakers with the same concerns, you are encouraged to appoint a spokesperson and avoid repetitive testimony.
4. The presiding commissioner will allot between one and three minutes per speaker per agenda item, subject to several exceptions:
    a. The presiding commissioner may allow up to five minutes for an individual speaker if a minimum of three individuals who are present when the agenda item is called have ceded their time to the designated spokesperson, and the individuals ceding time forfeit their right to speak to the agenda item.
    b. In-person participants ceding their time shall complete a speaker card and approach the staff table with the spokesperson so that staff may confirm the presence of those ceding their time. Persons participating via Zoom or phone and ceding their time to another speaker must notify the Commission at fgc@fgc.ca.gov prior to the start of the agenda item, including to whom they are ceding their time, and must be present during the agenda item.
    c. Individuals may receive advance approval for additional time to speak if such requests are received by email or delivery to the Commission office by the ***Supplemental Comment Deadline***. The president or designee will approve or deny the request no later than 5:00 p.m. two days prior to the meeting.
    d. An individual requiring an interpreter is entitled to at least twice the allotted speaking time pursuant to Government Code Section 11125.7(c).

e. An individual may receive additional time to speak to an agenda item at the request of any commissioner.

Agenda items may be heard in any order and on either day pursuant to the discretion of the presiding commissioner.

Visual Presentations/Materials

All electronic presentations must be submitted by the ***Supplemental Comment Deadline*** and approved by the Commission executive director before the meeting.

1. Electronic presentations must be provided by email to fgc@fgc.ca.gov. If the presentation file is too large to send via email, contact staff to identify an alternative method for submitting the file.
2. All electronic formats must be Windows PC compatible.
3. If presenting at the in-person meeting location, it is recommended that you bring a print copy of your presentation in case of technical difficulties.

From: California Fish and Game Commission
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Continuation Notice - Recreational Crab Gear and CPFV Validation
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 1:49:26 PM

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

View as a webpage / share

California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Revised Proposed Changes in Regulations

Greetings,

A notice of sufficiently related changes to the proposed regulations regarding recreational crab fishing gear and commercial passenger fishing vessel (CPFV) validation has been posted to the Commission's website. The notice and associated documents can be accessed at: https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2025-New-and-Proposed#RCCPFV.

Sincerely,

David Haug
California Fish and Game Commission

Click here to visit our regulations page

Not signed up to receive our informative emails?

Sign Up

Do not reply to this message. FGC@public.govdelivery.com is for outgoing messages only.

California Fish and Game Commission
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:
Manage Subscriptions | Help

This email was sent to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

TITLE 14. Fish and Game Commission
Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by Sections **200, 205, 399, 7075 and 7078** of the Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific Sections **200, 205, 270, 275, 7050, 7055 and 7056** of said Code, proposes to **amend** Sections 29.80, 29.85, 195, and 701, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to **Recreational Crab Fishing Gear and Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessel Trap Validation.**

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Unless otherwise specified, all section references in this document are to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR).

The Fish and Game Commission (Commission) proposes to amend sections 29.80, 29.85, 195, and 701, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR).

Background

Current regulations for the recreational Dungeness crab fishery specify seasons, size limits, bag and possession limits, closed fishing areas, and gear restrictions. Crabs can also be taken recreationally by hand, crab trap, crab loop trap (snare), or hoop net. Hoop nets may be used year-round for taking of crustaceans and have a service interval of two hours (subsection 29.80(b)(2)) and considered abandoned if left out longer than two hours (subsection 29.80(b)(3)). Current regulations do not limit the number, size or color of buoys used on hoop net gear. Hoop nets (not used from shore) must have a surface buoy that is marked to indicate specific operator either by an individual's GO ID, Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessel's (CPFV's) vessel commercial boat registration number, or guide license's identification number (subsection 29.80(b)(5)). There is no limit on the number of hoop nets that may be operated by an individual or CPFV when used north of Point Arguello, Santa Barbara County (subsection 29.80(b)(4)(B)).

CPFVs take customers on fishing trips and provide fishing gear, either with hoop nets or crab traps. Customers are required to have the proper licenses on board including a crab trap validation when CPFV's use traps. The owner and operator of a CPFV is required to keep and submit a complete and accurate record of fishing activities on a logbook (subsections 190(a) and 190(b)).

Recreational crab traps are evaluated for marine life entanglement risk during the Dungeness crab season under a marine life concentration trigger (subsection 29.80(c)(7)(A)). Under the recreational evaluation when marine life concentration triggers are met, the Director may declare a management action by RAMP Fishing Zone (subsection 29.80(c)(7)(C)). The only management actions the Director can implement are the following: a fleet advisory to employ voluntary practices, a trap prohibition at the start or end of the recreational Dungeness crab season or lifting of any trap prohibition (subsection 29.80(c)(7)(B)). This recreational entanglement evaluation regulatory framework also references definitions and management triggers described in the RAMP regulation (Section 132.8) for the commercial Dungeness crab fishery.

Proposed Changes

The proposed changes focus on updates to recreational crab gear restrictions to update use of hoop nets, provide additional tools to address entanglement risk of recreational crab traps, and prohibit unique line marks required in other fisheries from being used in recreational gear. They also address a regulations change petition (#2022-11) requesting the establishment of a CPFV validation so that CPFV customers would no longer be required to have a trap validation.

This is the summary of proposed regulations to recreational crab gear:

- **Add a hoop net tampering prohibition:** The proposed regulation would prevent unlawful tampering of hoop nets. (Proposed subsection 29.80(a)(3)(B)).
- **Prohibit the use of other West Coast fisheries' unique line marks/colors on hoop net and crab trap gear:** The proposed regulation would prohibit recreational gear for take of crustaceans from using another fishery's unique line marking. (Proposed subsection 29.80(a)(4)).
- **Clarify surface gear requirements for northern hoop nets:** The proposed regulation would standardize surface gear configurations of hoop nets used north of Point Arguello, Santa Barbara County. (Proposed subsection 29.80(b)(5)).
- **Update the marine life entanglement evaluation process:** The proposed regulation would add a trigger for confirmed entanglements of any protected species referenced in RAMP as well as a depth constraint under the available management actions (Proposed subsections 29.80(c)(7)(A), 29.80(c)(7)(B), and 29.80(c)(7)(D)).
- **Add a separate CPFV crab trap validation:** The proposed regulation would modify the current trap validation, creating a separate CPFV validation. In addition, new fields will be added to the CPFV logbook and a new fee for the CPFV validation. (Proposed subsections 29.85(a), 195(a), 195(b), 195(d), 701(i), and 701(j)).

The proposed regulatory package also includes clarifying and non-substantive edits to Section 29.80 and 29.85.

Benefits of the Regulations

The proposed regulations would clarify and improve enforceability of current regulations for hoop nets. Regulations support a petition request that also improves data collection efforts to inform fishery management. The proposal better aligns management of the recreational sector with the commercial fishery in mitigating entanglement risk of marine animals protected by the federal Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act. Lastly, the proposal parallels U.S. West Coast efforts to require uniquely marked gear by ensuring these marks are prohibited in California recreational crustacean gear.

Consistency and Compatibility with Existing Regulations

The proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. Section 20, Article IV, of the state Constitution specifies that the Legislature may delegate to the Commission such powers relating to the protection and propagation of fish and game as the Legislature sees fit. The Legislature has delegated to the Commission the power to adopt regulations governing recreational fishing regulations (Fish and Game Code sections

200, 205, 315, and 316.5). No other state agency has the authority to adopt regulations governing recreational fishing regulations. The Commission has reviewed its own regulations and finds that the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. The Commission has searched the CCR for any regulations regarding the adoption of recreational crab fishing regulations; therefore, the Commission has concluded that the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations.

Public Participation

Comments Submitted by Mail or Email

It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before **July 31, 2025** at the address given below, or by email to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Written comments mailed, or emailed to the Commission office, must be received before 12:00 noon on **August 8, 2025** If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address. Mailed comments should be addressed to Fish and Game Commission, PO Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090.

Meetings

NOTICE IS GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the **East End Complex Auditorium, 1500 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento,** California, which will commence at **8 a.m.** on **June 11, 2025** and may continue at **8 a.m.**, on **June 12, 2025.** This meeting will also include the opportunity to participate via webinar/teleconference. Instructions for participation in the webinar/teleconference hearing will be posted at www.fgc.ca.gov in advance of the meeting or may be obtained by calling 916-653-4899. Please refer to the Commission meeting agenda, which will be available at least 10 days prior to the meeting, for the most current information.

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the **California Natural Resources Building, Second Floor, 715 P Street, Sacramento,** California, which will commence at **8 a.m.** on **August 13, 2025** and may continue at **8 a.m.** on **August 14, 2025.** This meeting will also include the opportunity to participate via webinar/teleconference. Instructions for participation in the webinar/teleconference hearing will be posted at www.fgc.ca.gov in advance of the meeting or may be obtained by calling 916-653-4899. Please refer to the Commission meeting agenda, which will be available at least 10 days prior to the meeting, for the most current information.

Availability of Documents

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Action, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the text of the regulation in underline and strikeout format can be accessed through the Commission website at www.fgc.ca.gov. The regulations as well as all related documents upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, Melissa Miller-Henson, Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 715 P Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above-mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to Melissa Miller-Henson or **David Haug** at FGC@fgc.ca.gov or at the preceding address or phone number. **Christy Juhasz, Dungeness Crab Biologist, Department of Fish and Wildlife, AskMarine@wildlife.ca.gov, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.**

Availability of Modified Text

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Circumstances beyond the control of the Commission (e.g., timing of Federal regulation adoption, timing of resource data collection, timelines do not allow, etc.) or changes made to be responsive to public recommendation and comments during the regulatory process may preclude full compliance with the 15-day comment period, and the Commission will exercise its powers under Section 265 of the Fish and Game Code. Regulations adopted pursuant to this section are not subject to the time periods for adoption, amendment or repeal of regulations prescribed in sections 11343.4, 11346.4, 11346.8 and 11347.1 of the Government Code. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

Impact of Regulatory Action/Results of the Economic Impact Assessment

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

(a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Businesses, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states because the proposed regulations are for a recreational marine fishery. CPFVs that take fishers on crab fishing trips using crab traps as a fleet will now be required to purchase a CPFV-specific validation at $1,115.08 every 365 days [$18.28 x 61 vessels], while also indicating on their fishing logbooks the number of traps or hoop nets used per daily fishing trip in addition to the information they are already required to provide. There may be unrealized cost savings for serving customers on crab trap fishing trips since they are no longer required to purchase a trap validation. CPFVs also may need to purchase an additional buoy for any hoop nets deployed if they choose to use this for their operations, but it is not required. An optional yellow marker buoy could average $15.00 that if utilized, would be placed theoretically on up to 25 hoop nets (no hoop net limits), resulting in industry costs of approximately $30,214.06 [(($375 to add up to 25 buoys due to damage or loss, or $15.00 x 25 hoop net buoys) + ($120.31 in labor costs, or $19.25/hour x 0.25 hours/hoop net x 25 hoop nets per CPFV)) x 61 CPFVs] in initial costs.

The expected annual replacement cost for buoys in subsequent years to replace lost or damaged buoys (assuming an annual gear loss rate of 20% resulting in 10 buoys needing to be replaced annually) is approximately $10,618 [(($150 to replace up to 10 buoys due to damage or loss, or $15.00 x 10 hoop net buoys) + ($24.06 in labor costs, or $19.25/hour x 0.25 hours/hoop net x 5 hoop nets per CPFV)) x 61 CPFVs]. The total economic impact of buoy costs and CPFV validation costs to CPFVs is approximately $11,733 annually.

(b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California; Benefits of the Regulation to the Health and Welfare of California Residents, Worker Safety, and the State's Environment

The Commission does not anticipate any impacts on the creation or elimination of jobs, the creation of new business, the elimination of existing businesses or the expansion of businesses in California because the proposed regulations are not anticipated to affect the volume of recreational crabbing nor result in significant costs to CPFVs that serve recreational crab trappers.

The Commission does not anticipate any benefits to the health and welfare of California residents or to worker safety.

The Commission anticipates benefits to the state's environment by reducing potential for marine life entanglement risk. The approximate value of each prevented whale entanglement is $2,530,945 per whale, see Section C. Estimated Benefits in the addendum to the STD 399.

(c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business

Recreational crab fishers who solely use crab traps from CPFVs would no longer be required to purchase a Crab Trap Validation. However, CFPVs would be required to purchase a CPFV-specific validation [$18.28 per validation (includes $17.75 fee plus $0.53 surcharge) x approximately 61 vessels] that will be good for 365 days and could cover a recreational Dungeness crab season that spans two calendar years depending on time of purchase. Additionally, CPFVs that opt to use an additional buoy may realize additional costs of $75 a year if a buoy averages $15.00 and they replace about 10 hoop net buoys annually, plus the labor cost of approximately $24 for installing the buoys [$24.06 in labor costs, or $19.25/hr x 0.25 hours/hoop net x 5 hoop nets per CPFV]. The total cost of the validation fee and buoy costs per CPFV is approximately $194.

Northern hoop net users who opt to use an additional buoy may realize initial costs of around $75 if a buoy averages $15.00 and they use about 5 hoop nets (no hoop net limits) that would require an additional buoy, and ongoing costs of $75 in subsequent years to replace lost or damaged buoys.

(d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State

The proposed regulations are anticipated to introduce some start-up and ongoing implementation and enforcement costs that may be partially recovered with the CPFV-specific validation. An estimated $1,115.08 in CPFV-specific validation revenue is anticipated to be collected by the Department annually. However, removing 1,615 fishers from the requirement to purchase a recreational crab trap validation by fishing from a CPFV would result in a $4,570.45 loss in revenue for the Department, with a total net decrease of $3,455.37 in revenue for the Department. The Commission does not anticipate any savings to State agencies or cost/savings in federal funding to the State.

(e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies

None.

(f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts

None.

(g) Costs Imposed on Any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code

None.

(h) Effect on Housing Costs

None.

Effect on Small Business

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business. The Commission has drafted the regulations in Plain English pursuant to Government Code Sections 11342.580 and 11346.2(a)(1).

Consideration of Alternatives

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Melissa Miller-Henson
Executive Director

Dated: May 20, 2025

From: California Fish and Game Commission
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Notice of Proposed Emergency Regulations - Recreational Take of Rockfish, Cabezon, Greenling, and Lingcod
Date: Friday, August 15, 2025 8:20:59 AM

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

View as a webpage / share

Image of California Redwoods

California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Proposed Emergency Regulations

Greetings,

A notice of proposed emergency regulations regarding the recreational take of rockfish, cabezon, greenling, and lingcod has been posted to the Commission's website. The notice and associated documents can be accessed at: https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2025-New-and-Proposed#1-91.

Sincerely,

Sherrie Fonbuena
California Fish and Game Commission

Click here to visit our regulations page

Not signed up to receive our informative emails?

Sign Up

Do not reply to this message. FGC@public.govdelivery.com is for outgoing messages only.

California Fish and Game Commission
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:
Manage Subscriptions | Help

This email was sent to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Commissioners
Erika Zavaleta, President
Santa Cruz
Samantha Murray, Vice President
La Jolla
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Member
McKinleyville
Eric Sklar, Member
Saint Helena
Darius W. Anderson, Member
Kenwood

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Gavin Newsom, Governor

Fish and Game Commission

Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870

Melissa Miller-Henson
Executive Director
P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
(916) 653-4899
fgc@fgc.ca.gov

www.fgc.ca.gov

August 15, 2025

Notice of Proposed Emergency Action

Emergency Action to Amend Sections 1.91, 27.25, 27.30, 27.35, 27.40, and 28.55, Title 14, California Code of Regulations
Re: Recreational Take of Rockfish, Cabezon, Greenling, and Lingcod

Pursuant to the requirements of California Government Code Section 11346.1, the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) is providing notice of proposed emergency action with regard to the above-entitled emergency regulation.

Submission of Comments

California Government Code Section 11346.1 subdivision (a)(2) requires that, at least five working days prior to submission of the proposed emergency action to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL), the adopting agency provide a notice of the proposed emergency action to every person who has filed a request for notice of regulatory action with the agency. After submission of the proposed emergency to OAL, OAL shall allow interested persons five calendar days to submit comments on the proposed emergency regulations as set forth in California Government Code Section 11349.6.

Any interested person may present statements, arguments, or contentions, in writing, submitted via U.S. mail or e-mail, relevant to the proposed emergency regulatory action. Written comments submitted via U.S. mail or e-mail must be received at OAL within five days after the Commission submits the emergency regulations to OAL for review.

Please reference submitted comments as regarding “Recreational Take of Rockfish, Cabezon, Greenling, and Lingcod” addressed to:

Reference Attorney
Office of Administrative Law
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 1250
Sacramento, CA 95814
E-mail: staff@oal.ca.gov
Fax No.: 916-323-6826

California Fish and Game Commission
Attn: Sherrie Fonbuena
P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
Email: fgc@fgc.ca.gov
Fax No.: n/a

This emergency action was authorized by the Commission at its August 13-14, 2025 meeting. The Commission anticipates it will submit the rulemaking to OAL between August 22 and August 26, 2025. For the status of the Commission's submittal to OAL for review, and the end of the five-day written submittal period, please consult OAL's website at http://www.oal.ca.gov under the heading “Emergency Regulations.”

From: California Fish and Game Commission
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Notice of Proposed Extension of Emergency Regulations - Commercial Coonstripe Shrimp Fishery
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 7:58:37 AM

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

View as a webpage / share

California Redwoods

California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Proposed 90-Day Extension of Emergency Regulations

Greetings,

A notice of a proposed 90-day extension of emergency regulations regarding the commercial coonstripe shrimp fishery has been posted to the Commission's website. The notice and associated documents can be accessed at https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2025-New-and-Proposed#180-15E1.

Sincerely,

Jenn Bacon
California Fish and Game Commission

Click here to visit our regulations page

Not signed up to receive our informative emails?

Sign Up

Do not reply to this message. FGC@public.govdelivery.com is for outgoing messages only.

California Fish and Game Commission
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:
Manage Subscriptions | Help

This email was sent to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Commissioners
Erika Zavaleta, President
Santa Cruz
Samantha Murray, Vice President
La Jolla
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Member
McKinleyville
Eric Sklar, Member
Saint Helena
Darius W. Anderson, Member
Kenwood

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Gavin Newsom, Governor

Fish and Game Commission

Melissa A. Miller-Henson
Executive Director
P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
(916) 653-4899
fgc@fgc.ca.gov

www.fgc.ca.gov

Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870

August 19, 2025

Notice of Proposed 90-Day Extension of Emergency Action

Emergency Action to Amend Section 180.15
Title 14, California Code of Regulations
Re: Commercial Coonstripe Shrimp Fishery

Pursuant to the requirements of Government Code Section 11346.1, the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) is providing notice of proposed emergency action with regard to the above-entitled emergency regulation.

Submitting Comments

Government Code Section 11346.1, subdivision (a)(2), requires that, at least five working days prior to submitting a proposed emergency action to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL), the adopting agency provide a notice of the proposed emergency action to every person who has filed a request for notice of regulatory action with the agency. After submitting the proposed emergency to OAL, OAL shall allow interested persons five calendar days to submit comments on the proposed emergency regulations as set forth in Government Code Section 11349.6.

Any interested person may present statements, arguments, or contentions, in writing, submitted via U.S. mail or e-mail, relevant to the proposed emergency regulatory action. Written comments submitted via U.S. mail or e-mail must be received at OAL within five days after the Commission submits the emergency regulations to OAL for review.

Please reference submitted comments as regarding “Emergency Regulations: Commercial Coonstripe Shrimp Fishery” addressed to:

Reference Attorney
Office of Administrative Law
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 1250
Sacramento, CA 95814

E-mail: staff@oal.ca.gov
Fax No.: 916-323-6826

California Fish and Game Commission
Attn: Jenn Bacon
P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090

Email: fgc@fgc.ca.gov
Fax No.: n/a

This emergency action was authorized by the Commission at its August 13-14, 2025 meeting. The Commission anticipates it will submit the rulemaking to OAL on August 28, 2025. For the status of the Commission's submittal, and the end of the five-day written submittal period, please consult OAL's website at http://www.oal.ca.gov under “Emergency Regulations.”

From: California Fish and Game Commission
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations - Commercial Bull Kelp Harvest Restrictions
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 12:44:34 PM

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

View as a webpage / share

California Redwoods

California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations

Greetings,

A notice of proposed changes in regulations related to commercial bull kelp harvest restrictions and lease of kelp beds for the exclusive harvest of giant and bull kelp has been posted to the Commission's website. The notice and associated documents can be accessed at: https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2025-New-and-Proposed#165bull

Sincerely,

Sherrie Fonbuena
California Fish and Game Commission

Click here to visit our regulations page

Not signed up to receive our informative emails?

Sign Up

Do not reply to this message. FGC@public.govdelivery.com is for outgoing messages only.

California Fish and Game Commission
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:
Manage Subscriptions | Help

This email was sent to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

TITLE 14. Fish and Game Commission
Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by sections 6653, 6653.5, 6700 and 6701 of the California Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific sections 51, 6650, 6651, 6652, 6653, 6653.5, 6654, 6656, 6680, 6700, 6701, 6701.5, 6702, 6703, 6704, 6705, 6706, and 6707 of said Code, proposes to amend sections 165 and 165.5, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to commercial bull kelp harvest restrictions and lease of kelp beds for exclusive harvest of giant and bull kelp.

Unless otherwise specified, all section references in this document are to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Commission refers to the California Fish and Game Commission, and Department refers to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Current Regulations

The current regulations in Section 165 provide the general licensing provisions for the commercial harvest of kelp and other aquatic plants. The section also establishes harvest reporting and harvest royalty fee requirements, establishes geographical limitations on bull kelp harvesting, establishes harvesting method limitations on giant kelp, bull kelp, agar-bearing marine plants, and edible seaweed and prohibits the disturbance of certain aquatic plants. Although Section 165 provides regulations for kelp and other aquatic plants overall, it also contains subsections which provide more nuanced regulations depending on the species harvested and/or use of the harvest, including temporary harvest restrictions and weekly reporting for bull kelp which sunset on January 1, 2026.

The existing regulations in Section 165.5 define procedures for leasing administrative kelp beds for the exclusive right to harvest giant or bull kelp. In addition, the regulation spatially describes the existing 87 administrative kelp beds under the following management categories: open, closed, leaseable, and lease only. The designations were designed for optimal harvest, while ensuring sustainable management of the resource and the species that depend upon kelp. Administrative kelp beds 308, 309, and 312 in Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte counties are designated as lease only beds wherein only harvest by lease holders is allowed; however, current regulations allow limited harvest for human consumption of the lease only and closed beds within the limits specified in subsection 165(e). Section 165.5 also provides information on temporary lease closures for bull kelp beds 308, 309, and 312 which sunset on January 1, 2026.

Proposed Amendments

Subsection 165(c): The Department recommends temporary prohibitions, limits, weekly reporting, and lease restrictions for commercial harvest of bull kelp (Nereocystis luetkeana).

- The proposed amendment to subsection 165(c)(9) extends the sunset date pertaining to the current harvest restrictions and weekly reporting for bull kelp in Del Norte and Humboldt counties from January 1, 2026 to January 1, 2029.

- Two options are provided for Mendocino and Sonoma counties.
    - Under Option 1 (Department recommendation), the proposed amendment to subsection 165(c)(9) extends the sunset date pertaining to the closure of commercial bull kelp harvest in Mendocino and Sonoma counties from January 1, 2026 to January 1, 2029.
    - Under Option 2, the proposed amendment to subsection 165(c)(9) implements an annual fishery quota, from 1 to 2,000 pounds wet weight, in Mendocino and Sonoma counties combined with the amount to be determined by the Commission; mandatory weekly reporting for bull kelp harvesters in Mendocino and Sonoma counties; authorization for the Department to temporarily close harvest in order to obtain an accurate tally of the harvest; the potential for individual harvester allotments to ensure the quota is not exceeded; the mathematical formula to calculate the fishery allotments if the fishery is temporarily closed and reopened; the process by which the Department will notify the public and harvesters of the attainment of the quota; the harvesters' responsibility to monitor the Department's website to be kept informed of the remaining annual fishery quota; and the requirement that harvest in excess of the annual overall fishery quota or allotments shall be disposed of or used in a manner determined by the Department by forfeiting the excess harvest to the Department. These provisions would sunset on January 1, 2029.

Subsection 165.5(c): The proposed amendment to subsection 165.5(c) extends the temporary closure and lease prohibition of the lease only administrative kelp beds 308, 309, and 312 from January 1, 2026 to January 1, 2029 and amends the availability to lease administrative kelp beds 308, 309, and 312 from "on or after January 2, 2026" to "on or after January 2, 2029."

The Department is also recommending correcting a coordinate error for administrative kelp bed 109.

Subsection 165.5(k)(2)(I): The proposed amendment to subsection 165.5(k)(2)(I) corrects the second coordinate in the description of administrative kelp bed 109 from **34**° 58.999′ N. lat. 119° 29.556′ W. long to **33**° 58.999′ N. lat. 119° 29.556′ W. long. A typographical error was introduced in rulemaking file 2013-1205-01S that placed the coordinate on land; this proposed amendment will correct the coordinate to that which was originally noticed in that rulemaking.

Minor edits are proposed for clarity and consistency.

Benefits of the Regulations

Under the Marine Life Management Act (MLMA), it is the policy of the state to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and restoration of California's living marine resources for the benefit of all citizens of the state (Fish and Game Code (FGC), Section 7050). Furthermore, FGC defines a fishery as one or more populations of marine fish or marine plants that may be treated as a unit for purposes of conservation and management and that are identified on the basis of geographical, scientific, technical, recreational, and economic characteristics (FGC, Section 94).

Kelp is therefore considered a fishery and is subject to the policy of the state that programs for the conservation and management of the marine fishery resources of California shall be established and administered to prevent overfishing, to rebuild depressed stocks, to ensure conservation, to facilitate

long-term protection, and, where feasible, restoration of marine fishery habitats, and to achieve the sustainable use of the state's fishery resources [subdivision 7055(b), FGC] and that fisheries are conducted sustainably so that long-term health of the resources is not sacrificed in favor of short-term benefits [subdivision 7056(a), FGC].

To meet the goals of these policies, the Department has determined that a precautionary approach is warranted to protect and maintain the remaining bull kelp along the northern California coast.

The changes to the bull kelp regulations are proposed with the goal to protect and maintain the remaining bull kelp beds in Sonoma, Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte counties.

The temporary nature of the proposed bull kelp regulations provides an interim management measure to protect the resource while allowing for the Department, Tribes, industry, and interested stakeholders to continue to collaboratively develop the Kelp Restoration and Management Plan, a comprehensive management framework for kelp.

The proposed regulations will provide benefits to the sustainable management of kelp resources and will provide regulatory clarity and enforceability.

Business Reporting Requirements

The Commission finds it is necessary for the welfare of the people of the state that the proposed reporting requirements apply to business.

Consistency and Compatibility with Existing Regulations

The proposed regulatory changes are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. Section 20, Article IV, of the state Constitution specifies that the Legislature may delegate to the Commission such powers relating to the protection and propagation of fish and game as the Legislature sees fit. The Legislature has delegated to the Commission the power to adopt regulations governing the harvest of kelp and other aquatic plants for profit (FGC, Section 6653). No other state agency has the authority to adopt regulations governing the harvest of kelp and other aquatic plants for profit. Commercially manufactured and processed food for human consumption in California is regulated by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH); however, CDPH regulations do not address the harvesting of kelp. The Commission has reviewed its own regulations and finds that the proposed regulatory changes are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. The Commission has searched the CCR and has found no other state agency regulations pertaining to the commercial harvest of kelp and other aquatic plants; therefore, the Commission has concluded that the proposed regulatory changes are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations.

Public Participation

Comments Submitted by Mail or Email

It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before September 26, 2025 at the address given below, or by email to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Written comments mailed, or emailed to the Commission office, must be received before 12:00 noon on October 7, 2025. If you

would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address. Mailed comments should be addressed to Fish and Game Commission, PO Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090.

Meetings

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the East End Complex Auditorium, 1500 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, California, which will commence at 8:00 a.m. on October 8, 2025 and may continue at 8:00 a.m., on October 9, 2025. The Commission will make a reasonable effort to provide the public additional opportunities to observe or provide comment in the meeting through the Zoom videoconference platform by computer, mobile device, or telephone connections. However, the Commission cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of the remote connection options. Should technical issues affect remote attendee access or quality, an attempt will be made to resolve them, but the meeting will continue with in-person attendees. Instructions for participation in the webinar/teleconference hearing will be posted at www.fgc.ca.gov in advance of the meeting or may be obtained by calling 916-653-4899. Please refer to the Commission meeting agenda, which will be available at least 10 days prior to the meeting, for the most current information.

Availability of Documents

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Action, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the text of the regulation in underline and strikeout format can be accessed through the Commission website at www.fgc.ca.gov. The regulations as well as all related documents upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, Melissa Miller-Henson, Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 715 P Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above-mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to Melissa Miller-Henson or Sherrie Fonbuena at FGC@fgc.ca.gov or at the preceding address or phone number. **Environmental Scientist, Rebecca Flores Miller, Department of Fish and Wildlife, who can be reached at kelp@wildlife.ca.gov, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.**

Availability of Modified Text

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

Impact of Regulatory Action/Results of the Economic Impact Assessment

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

(a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Business, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The proposed action will not have a significant adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with business in other states.

The proposed amendments extend the current temporary regulatory amendments established through OAL rulemaking file 2022-1014-04SR that closed all commercial bull kelp harvest in Sonoma and Mendocino counties and imposed an annual fishery quota and weekly reporting for bull kelp harvest in Humboldt and Del Norte counties.

The temporary four ton (8,000 lbs) annual fishery quota restriction that expires on January 1, 2026 for Del Norte and Humboldt counties combined has not restricted the industry from harvest in these counties. Weekly reporting of commercial harvest of bull kelp in the combined counties reflected 1,620.2 lbs in 2023 and 2,926.2 lbs in 2024. Extending the current annual fishery quota in Del Norte and Humboldt counties combined would maintain current use and harvest post-2014. Due to the temporary closure, no commercial harvest of bull kelp was reported in Sonoma and Mendocino counties in 2023 and 2024.

Commercial harvesters in Mendocino and Sonoma counties did not shift their harvest to Del Norte and Humboldt counties during the temporary closure in 2023 and 2024. Under Option 2, the reopening of Mendocino and Sonoma counties to harvest could potentially yield an annual monetary benefit of approximately $21,406 if the full 2,000-pound wet weight harvest quota is met while also introducing approximately $120 in reporting costs per harvester. See the Addendum to the economic and fiscal impact statement (STD 399) for further details.

Commercial harvest of wild marine algae is not allowed in nearby states of Oregon and Washington. Therefore, the industry is not competing with nearby markets for harvested kelp.

(b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California; Benefits of the Regulation to the Health and Welfare of California Residents, Worker Safety, and the State's Environment:

The Commission does not anticipate any impacts on the creation or elimination of jobs, the creation of new business, the elimination of existing businesses or the expansion of businesses in California. Under Option 2 harvesters in Sonoma and Mendocino counties may resume their harvesting activities, but it is anticipated that this will reactivate existing harvesters from that area who did not move to Del Norte or Humboldt counties.

The Commission does not anticipate any benefits to health and welfare of California residents or worker safety under either option.

The Commission anticipates benefits to the state's environment in the sustainable management of this resource. As a foundational species forming the physical structure of kelp forest habitats, bull kelp supports fisheries, cultural and ceremonial traditions, and tourism.

(c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The current long-standing monthly harvest reporting requirement for all commercially harvested marine alga will continue. The proposed extension of the current weekly reporting requirement for bull kelp harvest would continue to introduce additional time for harvesters in Del Norte and Humboldt counties, which is estimated to be about $200 annually per harvester (see Table 1. Bull Kelp Harvester Weekly Reporting Costs for Del Norte and Humboldt Counties in the STD 399 Addendum). If Option 2 is selected, it is estimated that harvesters in Sonoma and Mendocino counties would face annual reporting costs of approximately $120 per harvester (see STD 399 Addendum for further details).

(d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

Management of bull kelp harvest quota and weekly reporting of harvest will continue for an additional three years for the Department. Management tasks in counties with a harvest quota will include: weekly compiling and tracking of harvest and posting status updates on the Department webpage, comparison of weekly to monthly reporting and communications with license holders as needed if discrepancies occur in the reports, determining status of harvest toward the quota as needed, drafting and emailing notices to license holders prior to implementation of restrictions triggered by the quota, posting notice of temporary closure or closures on the Department webpage, and ensuring any harvest in excess of any established quota is forfeited to the Department through a Release of Property form. The continuation of these activities by the Department does not represent a new cost to the state as it has already been budgeted. However, under Option 2 the Department could see up to $24 in additional annual revenue from the collection of the edible seaweed royalty in the reopened Sonoma and Mendocino counties, see STD 399 Addendum for further details.

(e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies:

None.

(f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts:

None.

(g) Costs Imposed on any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code:

None.

(h) Effect on Housing Costs:

None.

(i) Business Reporting Requirements:

The current long-standing monthly harvest reporting requirement for all commercially harvested marine algae will continue. The proposed regulations extend the current weekly reporting requirements for commercial harvest of bull kelp in Humboldt and Del Norte counties for three years and, under Option 2, implement weekly reporting requirements for commercial harvest of bull kelp in Sonoma and Mendocino counties for three years. The data provided in the weekly reports will help the Department to monitor bull kelp harvest in order to obtain an accurate tally of harvest and avoid exceeding the annual harvest quota. Without these weekly reporting requirements for commercial harvester businesses, the Department's ability to closely monitor bull kelp harvest in order to obtain an accurate tally of harvest and to avoid exceeding the annual harvest quota would not be realized.

It is the policy of the state to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and restoration of California's living marine resources for the benefit of all citizens of the state and that programs for the conservation and management of the marine fishery resources be established and administered to prevent overfishing, to rebuild depressed stocks, to ensure conservation, to facilitate long-term protection, and, where feasible, restoration of marine fishery habitats, and to achieve the sustainable use of the state's fishery resources and that fisheries are conducted sustainably so that long-term health of the resources is not sacrificed in favor of short-term benefits. Therefore, the Commission finds it is necessary for the welfare of the people of the state that the proposed reporting requirements apply to business.

Effect on Small Business

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business. The Commission has drafted the regulations in Plain English pursuant to Government Code Sections 11342.580 and 11346.2(a)(1).

Consideration of Alternatives

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Melissa Miller-Henson
Executive Director

Dated: August 12, 2025

From: California Fish and Game Commission
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations to Add Invasive Non-Native Mussels and Green Crab to List of Live Restricted Animals
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 1:02:01 PM

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

View as a webpage / share

California Redwoods

California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations

Greetings,

A notice of proposed changes in regulations related to adding invasive non-native mussels and green crab to the list of restricted animals has been posted to the Commission's website. The notice and associated documents can be accessed at: https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2025-New-and-Proposed#671CoC

Sincerely,

Sherrie Fonbuena
California Fish and Game Commission

Click here to visit our regulations page

Not signed up to receive our informative emails?

Sign Up

Do not reply to this message. FGC@public.govdelivery.com is for outgoing messages only.

California Fish and Game Commission
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:
Manage Subscriptions | Help

This email was sent to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

TITLE 14. Fish and Game Commission
Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by sections 2118 and 2120 of the California Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific sections 1002, 2116, 2118, 2118.2, 2118.4, 2119, 2120, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2150, 2190 and 2271 of said Code, proposes to amend Section 671, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, to add invasive non-native mussels and green crab to the list of live restricted animals.

Unless otherwise specified, all section references in this document are to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Commission refers to the California Fish and Game Commission and Department refers to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Current regulations in Section 671 contain the list of restricted species that are unlawful for any person to import, transport, or possess except as authorized in a permit issued by the Department. Under emergency regulatory authority, golden mussel (*Limnoperna fortunei*) was added to the list of restricted animals in December 2024 (Office of Administrative Law File Number 2024-1213-03E).

The proposed changes will add green crab (*Carcinus maenas*), an invasive, non-native crustacean species, and the *Limnoperna*, *Sinanodonta* and *Xenostrobus* genera which are invasive, non-native bivalve species, to the list of restricted animals consistent with California Fish and Game Code sections 2118 and 2120.

Background

Green Crab (*C. maenas*)

The green crab (*C. maenas*), also known as the European green crab, native to the northeast Atlantic Ocean and northern Africa, is an invasive non-native species in California.

Green crab was first detected in California in 1989 in the southern San Francisco Bay. It is suspected that the green crab arrived in seaweed-wrapped bait shipments from the East Coast of the U.S. Since then, green crab has been identified in many California bays and estuaries including, but not limited to, San Francisco Bay and Bay Delta, Elkhorn Slough, Bolinas Lagoon, Bodega Bay, Tomales Bay, Morro Bay and Humboldt Bay. There is concern that green crab can continue to expand beyond currently established populations in California and cause extensive damage to recreational and commercial fishery resources, aquaculture, native fisheries, and sensitive habitat.

On July 7, 2017, the Commission received a petition for regulatory change (Petition 2017-006) from Mr. Joshua Russo, President of the Watermen's Alliance, requesting that regulations be adopted to list green crab as an invasive aquatic species. The Department evaluated the petition and provided a recommendation to the Commission to grant the petition.

At its April 2018 meeting, the Commission agreed with the Department's recommendation and granted the petition for consideration in a future rulemaking.

Golden Mussel (genus *Limnoperna*)

On October 17, 2024, golden mussel (*L. fortunei*), an invasive, freshwater bivalve native to rivers and creeks of China and Southeast Asia, was discovered in the Port of Stockton by California Department of Water Resources (DWR) staff while conducting routine operations. This was the first known occurrence of this highly invasive species in North America. Additional discoveries of golden mussel have occurred throughout the Delta and interconnected waters, including the lower reach of the San Joaquin River (San Joaquin County), and at several points in the California Aqueduct including, from north-to-south, Bethany Reservoir (Alameda County), O'Neill Forebay (Merced County), Dos Amigos Pumping Plant (Merced County), Pleasant Valley Pumping Plant (Fresno County), Las Perillas Pumping Plant on the Coastal Branch Aqueduct (Kings County), and Check 24 (Kings County). Without actions to prevent further spread, golden mussel is also likely to spread overland on trailered watercraft and equipment out of the Delta and to nearby and distant fresh and brackish waters, including rivers, lakes, and reservoirs within California and the rest of North America.

Golden mussel is known to be established outside of its native range in Hong Kong, Japan, Taiwan, Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Argentina. Impacts in these invaded regions include heavy encrustations of golden mussels forming dense reef-like structures that block municipal and industrial water supplies, agricultural irrigation, and power plant operations, necessitating ongoing biofouling removal. In most cases, the invaded range has expanded upstream from the point of introduction, and inland from ports through local, human-mediated pathways. Within the invaded range, significant impacts resulting from the dense colonization of golden mussels on hard surfaces are widely documented.

At its December 11, 2024 meeting, the Commission approved an emergency rulemaking to add golden mussel (*L. fortunei*) to the list of restricted animals in Section 671 (Office of Administrative Law File Number 2024-1213-03E). The proposed rulemaking will serve as the certificate of compliance for the addition of *L. fortunei* to the list of restricted animals.

Beyond the immediate threat of *L. fortunei*, the other five species within the genus *Limnoperna* mussels have the potential to be inadvertently introduced to California, and likely to have similar negative impacts to California as *L. fortunei*. Other species within the genus *Limnoperna* include *L. siamensis*, *L. ngocngai*, *L. bogani*, *L. sambasensis*, and L. taprobanensis. *Limnoperna* mussels are native to Asia, primarily Southeast Asia. Most *Limnoperna* species can be found in freshwater to estuarine habitats, although it is hypothesized that *L. taprobanensis* is a marine species.

Outside of *L. fortunei*, there are few records of invasions outside of their native ranges by other species of *Limnoperna*; however, available literature indicates they may have similar biology and impacts as *L. fortunei*.

Pond Mussels (genus *Sinanodonta*)

Pond mussels (*Sinanodonta*) (also known as Asian pond mussels) are freshwater unionid bivalves of 26 species that are fast-growing and can reach high densities. Species within *Sinanodonta* are difficult to morphologically identify, which has led to extensive misidentification of species. Additionally, the molecular taxonomy within the genus is still being resolved.

Native to Eastern Asia including China and eastern Russia, Japan and Korea, three species of *Sinanodonta* (*S. woodiana*, *S. lauta*, and S. pacifica) have been documented to be invasive outside of their native ranges and have spread rapidly to other countries including Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Iran, South Korea, Myanmar, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Borneo, Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, Spain, France, Italy, Germany, Austria, Slovakia, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Poland, Croatia, Serbia, Romania, Moldova, Belgium, Ukraine and Sweden.

In 2010, *S. woodiana* was detected for the first time in the United States within aquaculture ponds in Franklin Township, New Jersey. Pond mussel has not been detected in California, or any other U.S. state with the exception of New Jersey.

Based on the establishment of *S. woodiana* in North America, potential vectors of introduction, and anticipated impacts to native species and the environment, prohibiting all species in the genus *Sinanodonta* is warranted.

Axe-Head Mussel (genus *Xenostrobus*)

Axe-head mussel (*Xenostrobus securis*), a small, non-native, invasive, biofouling brackish water bivalve, was discovered on December 6, 2024, just north of the Port of Long Beach and Port of Los Angeles in the lower reaches of Dominguez Channel, Los Angeles County. This detection was made by Department staff conducting early detection monitoring for invasive mussels. This is the first known occurrence of the invasive species in North America. Shortly after, axe-head mussels were detected in high densities at additional sites including the lower reaches of San Gabriel River (February 21, 2025) and Los Angeles River (February 27, 2025).

Axe-head mussel is one of eight extant species of the genus *Xenostrobus*. These species include *X. pulex* and *X. securis* from Australia and New Zealand, *X. inconstans* from Australia, *X. balani*, *X. mangle* and *X. sambasensis* from Southeast Asia, *X. hepatica* from Fiji, and *X. atratus* from Japan, Korea, and China. Axe-head mussel (X. securis) has been introduced and established outside of its native ranges in Japan, China, Korea, Hong Kong, Italy, France, and Spain.

Globally axe-head mussel was likely introduced by ballast water discharge and biofouling on ships. Without containment, axe-head mussel is likely to spread via watercraft in the marine environment to other estuaries, brackish waters, and ports of California, other U.S. states and territories, and internationally, and overland on trailered vessels and equipment in North America.

Beyond the immediate threat of axe-head mussel, the other seven species of *Xenostrobus* mussels have the potential to be inadvertently introduced to California, and are likely to have similar negative impacts to California as axe-head mussel.

Proposed Changes

The proposed regulations add green crab, and the *Limnoperna*, *Sinanodonta*, and *Xenostrobus* genera to the list of live animals restricted from importation, transportation and possession:

Section 671. Importation, Transportation and Possession of Live Restricted Animals.

Amend subsection (c)(8) from Class Crustacea to Class Malacostraca to update and correct the Class for the species in this subsection. The Class Crustacea has been reclassified by The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to a higher level and is now a subphylum of the phylum Arthropoda.

Add subsection (c)(8)(C) *Carcinus maenas* (green crab) (D).

Adding green crab, which causes harm to native species and the ecosystems they depend on to survive, to the list of restricted animals is necessary to protect against the spread of this invasive species in California. Prohibiting importation, transportation, and possession of this species will prevent further introductions and slow the spread within and outside of California.

Amend subsection (c)(10) Class Bivalvia-Bivalves to move “All members of the genus *Dreissena* (zebra and quagga mussels) (D).” under subsection (A) to allow for the addition of other species under this class.

Add subsection (c)(10)(B) All members of the genus *Limnoperna* (golden mussel) (D).

Adding all members of the genus *Limnoperna* (golden mussel), which can cause harm to native species and the ecosystems they depend on to survive, as well as infrastructure, to the list of restricted animals is necessary to protect against the spread of these invasive species in California. Prohibiting importation, transportation, and possession of the species will prevent further introductions and slow the spread within and outside of California.

Add subsection (c)(10)(C) All members of the genus *Sinanodonta* (pond mussel, Asian pond mussel) (D).

Adding all members of the genus *Sinanodonta* (pond mussel), which can cause harm to native species and the ecosystems they depend on to survive, to the list of restricted animals is necessary to protect against the spread of these invasive species in California. Prohibiting importation, transportation, and possession of the species will prevent further introductions and slow the spread within and outside of California.

Add subsection (c)(10)(D) All members of the genus *Xenostrobus* (axe-head mussel) (D).

Adding all members of the genus *Xenostrobus* (axe-head mussel), which can cause harm to native species and the ecosystems they depend on to survive, as well as infrastructure, to the list of restricted animals is necessary to protect against the spread of these invasive species in California. Prohibiting importation, transportation, and possession of the species will prevent further introductions and slow the spread within and outside of California.

Benefits of the Regulation:

The California Legislature has declared that some wild animals are a threat to native wildlife or the agricultural interests of the state and that some wild animals are a threat to public health and safety. It is the Legislature’s intention that the importation, transportation and possession of wild animals be

regulated to protect the native wildlife and agricultural interests of the state against damage from the existence at large of certain wild animals and to protect the health and safety in this state. The proposed regulations will help to prevent the new introductions of species within the *Limnoperna*, *Sinanodonta*, and *Xenostrobus* genera to waterbodies of the state and the translocation of green crab, and members of the *Limnoperna* and *Xenostrobus* genera to other waterbodies in the state and beyond, thereby protecting native wildlife, the agricultural interests of the state and public health and safety.

Consistency and Compatibility with Existing Regulations

Article IV, Section 20 of the California Constitution specifies that the Legislature may delegate to Commission such powers relating to the protection and propagation of fish and game as the Legislature sees fit. The Legislature has delegated to the Commission the power to regulate the importation, transportation and possession of wild animals to protect the native wildlife, agricultural interests of the state, and the health and safety in this state (California Fish and Game Code Section 2118). The Commission has reviewed its own regulations and finds that the proposed regulations are consistent with other regulations in Title 14, CCR, and therefore finds that the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. The Commission has searched the California Code of Regulations and finds no other state agency regulations pertaining to species on the list of restricted animals.

Public Participation

Comments Submitted by Mail or Email

It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before September 26, 2025 at the address given below, or by email to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Written comments mailed, or emailed to the Commission office, must be received before 12:00 noon on October 7, 2025. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address. Mailed comments should be addressed to Fish and Game Commission, PO Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090.

Meetings

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the East End Complex Auditorium, 1500 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, California, which will commence at 8:00 a.m. on October 8, 2025 and may continue at 8:00 a.m., on October 9, 2025. The Commission will make a reasonable effort to provide the public additional opportunities to observe or provide comment in the meeting through the Zoom videoconference platform by computer, mobile device, or telephone connections. However, the Commission cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of the remote connection options. Should technical issues affect remote attendee access or quality, an attempt will be made to resolve them, but the meeting will continue with in-person attendees. Instructions for participation in the webinar/teleconference hearing will be posted at www.fgc.ca.gov in advance of the meeting or may be obtained by calling 916-653-4899. Please refer to the Commission meeting agenda, which will be available at least 10 days prior to the meeting, for the most current information.

Availability of Documents

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Action, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the text of the regulation in underline and strikeout format can be accessed through the Commission website at www.fgc.ca.gov. The regulations as well as all related documents upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, Melissa Miller-Henson, Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 715 P Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above-mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to Melissa Miller-Henson or Sherrie Fonbuena at FGC@fgc.ca.gov or at the preceding address or phone number. **Environmental Program Manager, Martha Volkoff, Department of Fish and Wildlife, who can be reached at Invasives@wildlife.ca.gov, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.**

Availability of Modified Text

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

Impact of Regulatory Action/Results of the Economic Impact Assessment

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

(a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Business, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The proposed regulations are not expected to impact businesses, as adding a species to the list of restricted animals in Section 671 does not impose any actions that should be taken by businesses to comply, nor does it impose fees or fines upon them. Because these effects are economically neutral, it is not anticipated that any businesses will experience adverse economic impacts that would affect their ability to compete with businesses from other states as a result of these regulations.

(b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California; Benefits of the Regulation to the Health and Welfare of California Residents, Worker Safety, and the State's Environment:

The proposed regulations are not expected to impact businesses, as adding a species to the list of restricted animals in Section 671 does not necessitate that any actions should be taken by businesses to comply, nor does it impose fees or fines upon them. Because these effects are economically neutral, it is not anticipated that any businesses will experience adverse economic impacts that would affect the creation or elimination of jobs within the state, create new businesses or eliminate existing businesses, affect the expansion of existing businesses, or benefit worker safety as a result of these regulations. The proposed changes are sought to protect native wildlife and the agricultural interests of the state and public health and welfare and the state's environment.

The Commission anticipates benefits to the health and welfare of California residents from better protection of the state's natural resources. The proposed regulations will help to prevent the introduction and/or translocation of members of the *Limnoperna* (golden mussel), *Sinanodonta* and *Xenostrobus* genera to other waterbodies in the state and beyond, which may help to protect water conveyance and hydroelectric power systems.

The Commission anticipates benefits of the regulation to the state's environment. The California Legislature has declared that some wild animals are a threat to native wildlife or the agricultural interests of the state and that some wild animals are a threat to public health and safety. It is the Legislature's intention that the importation, transportation and possession of wild animals be regulated to protect the native wildlife and agricultural interests of the state against damage from the existence at large of certain wild animals and to protect the health and safety in this state. The proposed regulations will help to prevent the new introductions of species within the *Limnoperna*, *Sinanodonta*, and *Xenostrobus* genera to waterbodies of the state and the translocation of green crab, and members of the *Limnoperna* and *Xenostrobus* genera to other waterbodies in the state and beyond, thereby protecting native wildlife, and the agricultural interests of the state.

(c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The Commission is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

The proposed regulations are not expected to create direct cost impacts for businesses or individuals, as adding a species to the list of restricted animals in Section 671 does not necessitate that any actions should be taken by businesses or individuals to comply, nor does it impose fees or fines upon them.

(d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

Including the species and genera proposed on the list of restricted animals does not necessarily compel a requirement to act upon state agencies, but rather enables existing

programs to include the species in their enforcement actions for detection and prevention. As such, the Commission does not anticipate any direct costs or savings to the Department or other state agencies as a result of this action. There may be future complementary authorities or requirements for managing the species proposed that will come from elsewhere, such as legislation, compelling costs associated with preventing the spread of these invasive species.

(e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies:

None.

(f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts:

None.

(g) Costs Imposed on any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code:

None.

(h) Effect on Housing Costs:

None.

(i) Business Reporting Requirements:

The proposed action does not impose a business reporting requirement.

Effect on Small Business

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business. The Commission has drafted the regulations in Plain English pursuant to Government Code Sections 11342.580 and 11346.2(a)(1).

Consideration of Alternatives

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Melissa Miller-Henson
Executive Director

Dated**:** August 12, 2025

From: California Fish and Game Commission
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Notice of Proposed Second Extension of Emergency Regulations - Restricted Animals: Golden Mussel
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 8:41:19 AM

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

View as a webpage / share

California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Proposed Second Extension of Emergency Regulations

Greetings,

A notice of a proposed second 90-day extension of emergency regulations to add golden mussel to the list of restricted animals has been posted to the Commission's website. The notice and associated documents can be accessed at https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2025-New-and-Proposed#671EEE.

Sincerely,

Sherrie Fonbuena
California Fish and Game Commission

Click here to visit our regulations page

Not signed up to receive our informative emails?

Sign Up

Do not reply to this message. FGC@public.govdelivery.com is for outgoing messages only.

California Fish and Game Commission
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:
Manage Subscriptions | Help

This email was sent to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

State of California
Fish and Game Commission
Finding of Emergency and Statement of Proposed Emergency Regulatory Action

Second Readoption of Emergency Action to Amend Section 671
Title 14, California Code of Regulations
Re: Golden Mussel Emergency

Date of Statement: August 22, 2025

Throughout this document, CDFW refers to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Commission refers to the California Fish and Game Commission. Unless otherwise specified, all section references in this document are to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR).

I. Emergency Regulation in Effect to Date

At its December 11, 2024 meeting, the Commission approved an emergency rulemaking to add golden mussel (*Limnoperna fortunei*) to the list of restricted animals in Section 671 (Office of Administrative Law (OAL) File Number 2024-1213-03E). At its April 16, 2025 meeting, the Commission approved a first readoption for 90 days of the emergency regulations with no changes to the original emergency regulation text (OAL File Number 2025-0606-03EE).

Background

On October 17, 2024, golden mussel, an invasive, freshwater bivalve native to rivers and creeks of China and Southeast Asia, was discovered in the Port of Stockton by California Department of Water Resources (DWR) staff while conducting routine operations. This was the first known occurrence of this highly invasive species in North America. Shortly after, golden mussels were detected at additional sites in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta). The presence of the species poses a significant immediate threat to the ecological health of the Delta and all waters of the state, water conveyance systems, infrastructure, and water quality; its arrival in California is a state, national, and international concern. Without actions to prevent further spread, golden mussel is also likely to spread overland on trailered watercraft and equipment out of the Delta and to nearby and distant fresh and brackish waters, including rivers, lakes, and reservoirs within California and the rest of North America.

Golden mussel is known to be established outside of its native range in Hong Kong, Japan, Taiwan, Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Argentina. The initial introductions to these countries were likely the result of ships with biofouling on the hulls and/or ballast water release. Impacts in these invaded regions include heavy encrustations of golden mussels forming dense reef-like structures that block municipal and industrial water supplies, agricultural irrigation, and power plant operations, necessitating ongoing biofouling removal. In most cases, the invaded range has expanded upstream from the point of introduction, and inland from ports through local, human-mediated pathways. Within the invaded range, significant impacts resulting from the dense colonization of golden mussels on hard surfaces are widely documented.

Golden mussel has a similar appearance, biology, and impact as quagga and zebra (dreissenid) mussels. Golden mussels are small, typically under 1.5 inches in length, with shell color that is light golden to darker yellowish-brown to brown color. They firmly attach to hard to semi-hard surfaces. Adult golden mussels release eggs and sperm into the water column where fertilization

occurs. Fertilized eggs develop into planktonic larvae that remain suspended in the water column as they develop. Larvae are microscopic and by themselves cannot swim upstream but can be carried by flowing water and human-mediated pathways, such as water within watercraft. Once a suitable substrate is found, juvenile mussels settle and attach themselves to the substrate by strong fibers called byssal threads and develop into adults. Golden mussels can grow in dense colonies of hundreds of thousands of mussels per square meter.

Golden mussel can tolerate a wider range of environmental conditions than the invasive dreissenid mussels, including less calcium, higher salinity, and warmer water temperatures. Nearly all waters of California are conducive to golden mussel establishment.

Golden mussels were likely introduced to the Port of Stockton, San Joaquin County, by a ship traveling from an international port. Golden mussel is likely to spread throughout the interconnected Delta, upstream into Delta tributaries, as far west as Suisun Bay, and southward via the State Water Project and Central Valley Project that draw water from the Delta. Additional discoveries of golden mussel have occurred throughout the Delta and interconnected waters, including the lower reach of the San Joaquin River (San Joaquin County), and at several points in the California Aqueduct including, from north-to-south, Clifton Court Forebay (Contra Costa County), Bethany Reservoir (Alameda County), O'Neill Forebay (Merced County), Dos Amigos Pumping Plant (Merced County), Pleasant Valley Pumping Plant (Fresno County), Las Perillas Pumping Plant on the Coastal Branch Aqueduct (Kings County), Check 24 (Kings County), and Lake Palmdale (Los Angeles County).

Without containment, golden mussel is likely to spread overland on trailered vessels and equipment to other fresh and brackish waterbodies throughout California, and to other ports and inland waters of North America, and potentially abroad.

In response to the discovery of golden mussel, CDFW, in partnership with other agencies working in the Delta, began delineating the range of golden mussel in the Delta and throughout the state (Figure 1). Shortly thereafter, CDFW executive leadership convened an interagency Golden Mussel Task Force, comprised of a steering committee with members representing CDFW, DWR, State Parks-Division of Boating and Waterways, State Water Resources Control Board, California State Lands Commission, California Department of Food and Agriculture, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The task force also formed eight task-oriented teams of staff from these same agencies, and others, to implement immediate monitoring and outreach efforts, and develop and inform the content of a response framework.

On April 16, 2025, the Golden Mussel Task Force announced the completion of the Golden Mussel Response Framework (State of California, 2025). The Response Framework provides the state and partners with a coordinated strategy for moving forward. The scope of recommendations includes containment within waters where golden mussels have been detected, prevention at uninfested waters, evaluation of existing authorities and gaps, existing funding opportunities and needs, and an approach to partner and public engagement.

In addition, CDFW announced a one-time $1 million grant funding opportunity for nonprofit organizations, public agencies, and Tribal governments that own or operate boating facilities. The intention of the grant is to support one-time start-up costs for efforts to prevent the overland spread of invasive mussels from waters where they have been detected and prevent the introduction of invasive mussels to waters of California where they have not been detected.

Currently, there are no federal prohibitions for possessing or moving golden mussels. It is unlikely that any person is intentionally in possession of golden mussel, as they are not known to be a species for human consumption, for aquaculture or in the aquarium trade. In the event someone were to be in possession, intentionally or unintentionally, those mussels should be euthanized based on the currently effective emergency regulation. Pursuant to Section 671.1, golden mussels could be possessed under a permit issued by CDFW for purposes as defined in the regulations, or other existing CDFW permitting processes.

Figure 1. Golden mussel detections as of August 20, 2025 (map updated at https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Invasives/Species/Golden-Mussel#map).

II. Request for Approval of Readoption of Emergency Regulations

At its December 11, 2024 meeting, the Commission approved an emergency action that added golden mussel to the list of restricted animals. At its April 16, 2025 meeting, the Commission readopted the emergency regulations for an additional 90-day period.

The emergency rule will expire September 17, 2025, unless it is readopted for a second additional 90-day period. The continuation of the emergency action of adding golden mussel to the list of restricted animals is necessary to protect against the spread in California's waterways of this non-native, invasive species, which causes harm to native species and the ecosystems they depend on to survive, until a permanent regulation can be implemented.

At its August 13-14, 2025 meeting, the Commission authorized publication of a notice of its intent to adopt the regulations pursuant to the regular rulemaking process. It is expected that the Commission will adopt the regulations at its October 8-9, 2025 meeting and that the regulations will become effective in December 2025.

III. Statement of Facts Constituting the Need for Readoption of the Emergency Regulatory Action

In response to the emergency situation, the proposed regulatory action readopts the amendment of Section 671 to add golden mussel to the list of restricted animals. The proposed regulation for readoption is the same as the original emergency regulation and the first 90-day readoption.

The emergency action added the golden mussel (*Limnoperna fortunei)* species in new subsection 671(c)(10)(B). A second readoption of the addition of golden mussel to the list of restricted animals will continue the prohibition of importation, transportation, and possession of live golden mussels, thereby deterring people from moving them to other waters of the state and providing enforceability if golden mussels are found in someone's possession.

The second readoption will also indirectly continue to allow water managers operating mussel prevention programs grounds to refuse watercraft that are or suspected to be carrying golden mussels from launching into waterways, and law enforcement personnel to inspect watercraft and quarantine any vessels that are infested with golden mussels and/or detain vessels or equipment until such time as they no longer pose a threat to the environment. California Fish and Game Code sections 2118 and 2120 provide broad authority for the restricted species list implemented in Section 671. Cooperation with the California Department of Food and Agriculture is required for consideration of the addition or removal of classes, families, genera, and species from the list of restricted species (California Fish and Game Code subdivisions 2118(j) and (k)). Given the ramifications for spread of golden mussel, its presence is considered, "…undesirable, and a menace to native wildlife or the agricultural interests of the state."

IV. Existence of an Emergency and Need for Action

The Commission considered the following factors in determining that an emergency continues at this time.

The magnitude of potential harm:

In waterways where golden mussels are present, heavy encrustations of golden mussels have blocked municipal and industrial water intakes compelling ongoing biofouling removal (Xu et al.

2015; Zhao et al. 2019), harmed native species in the ecosystem (Boltovskoy and Correa 2015; Cataldo et al. 2012), facilitated aquatic weed growth, and diminished water quality (Zhang et al. 2022). Spread of golden mussel out of the Delta into fresh and brackish waters will cause infrastructural damage across the state and could threaten water delivery and electric power delivery from hydroelectric operations (for example, O'Neill Forebay). As an ecosystem engineer, golden mussel can permanently change ecosystem function. As large encrustations of reef-like structures grow in a stream or river, the increase in organic matter shifts varied microhabitats and their diversity to monocultures of species, slowly eliminating aquatic species diversity (Mouthino, 2021).

Given the very real harms presented by golden mussels, individuals within and entering California should not be importing, transporting, or possessing them, therefore, it is appropriate to maintain its restricted species status.

The existence of a crisis situation:

The October 2024 discoveries in the Delta are the first known occurrences of golden mussels in North America. The presence of the species poses a significant immediate threat to the state's environment, ecological health of the Delta and all waters of the state, water conveyance systems, infrastructure, electric power delivery from hydroelectric operations, and water quality.

Because of rapid golden mussel colonization of infrastructure and water conveyances, this new invasion is a significant threat to the Delta and waterbodies statewide, nationally, and internationally. Impacts are far-reaching, from water transfers inclusive of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project, to water agencies and distributors, to recreationists. Adverse impacts could be felt to recreation, transportation and shipping, agriculture, and municipal water supplies.

The immediacy of the need:

There is a significant immediate need to continue limiting the spread of this invasive species to prevent the translocation of this species to other waterbodies in the state and beyond. There is an immediate need to conduct vessel inspections to reduce the spread of the aquatic invasive species. CDFW law enforcement needs to be able to inspect watercraft and quarantine any vessels that are infested with golden mussels. Water managers must be able to refuse vessels and equipment that are or suspected to be carrying golden mussels from launching into lakes, reservoirs, or other waterways where golden mussels are not known to be present.

Previous cases, such as in South America, have seen ultra-rapid expansion after the first infestation (e.g., Darrigran and Damborenea 2005), invading both natural areas and human infrastructure. Aside from natural mussel propagation, spread is assisted by human activities including commerce, fishing, and recreation. Any lapse in facilitating vessel inspections could allow the mussel's range to spread to new areas and compromise efforts to control it.

CDFW is continuing to work with state, local, and federal agencies to enhance monitoring efforts, communicate additional detection and response information, and coordinate on potential next steps. If the spread of this species is not prevented, more waterways will be infested, further increasing the threat to uninfested waters.

Whether the anticipation of harm has a basis firmer than simple speculation:

Ecosystem degradation, infrastructure biofouling, and water quality decreases are all documented potential effects from golden mussel invasion. Costs for maintenance, control, and surveillance have skyrocketed following its spread in other invaded areas (Darrigran and Damborenea 2005). Golden mussel is also quite adaptable to a broad range of environmental conditions; it tolerates a wide range of temperatures, salinity, and other water quality factors, making its spread to disparate areas much more likely even than other bivalve invaders.

California's experience with dreissenid mussels over the last 18 years has demonstrated prevention and containment are effective to slowing the spread of mussels and avoiding widespread impacts resulting from invasive mussel establishment. This success would not have been achieved without the necessary authority.

V. Readoption Criteria

Same as or Substantially Equivalent

Pursuant to Government Code subdivision 11346.1(h), a readoption may be approved only if the regulation is "the same as or substantially equivalent to an emergency regulation previously adopted by that agency." The language proposed for this rulemaking is the same as the language of the original emergency regulation.

Substantial Progress

California Government Code subdivision 11346.1(h) specifies "Readoption shall be permitted only if the agency has made substantial progress and proceeded with diligence to comply with subdivision (e)" [California Government Code sections 11346.2 through 11347.3, inclusive].

A regular rulemaking (certificate of compliance) is currently underway and was authorized for public notice by the Commission at its August 13-14, 2025 meeting (OAL Notice ID Z2025-0812-07).

Proposed Action by the Commission

The Commission proposed readoption of the emergency amendment to Section 671 is the same as previously effective.

VI. Impact of Regulatory Action

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

(a) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

Continuing to include golden mussel on the list of restricted animals does not necessarily compel a requirement to act upon state agencies but rather enables existing programs to include the species in their enforcement actions for detection and prevention. As such, the Commission does not anticipate any direct costs or savings to CDFW or other state agencies as a result of this emergency action. There may be future complementary authorities or

requirements for managing golden mussels that will come from elsewhere, such as legislation, compelling costs associated with preventing the spread of golden mussels.

(b) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies:

None. Continuing to include golden mussel on the list of restricted animals will not have the potential for a fiscal effect on local governments, as the regulation only adds the species to the restricted animals list without prescribing specific enforcement actions to be taken by local government entities.

(c) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts:

None. Continuing to include golden mussel on the list of restricted animals will not have the potential for a fiscal effect on local governments or school districts, as the regulation only adds the species to the restricted animals list without mandating specific enforcement actions or programs to be taken by local government entities.

(d) Costs Imposed on Any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code: None.

(e) Effect on Housing Costs: None

VII. Technical, Theoretical, and/or Empirical Studies, Reports, or Documents Relied Upon:

State of California. 2025. Golden Mussel Response Framework. Available from: Golden Mussel Response Framework. April 14, 2025

California Department of Fish and Game. 2008. California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan; Draft Rapid Response Plan. State of California, Resources Agency. Available from: California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan.

Smith, R. and L. McMartin. 2011. Bay Delta Rapid Response Plan For Dreissenid Mussels. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service developed for the California Department of Fish and Game #P0685514. Stockton, CA.

VIII. Documents Providing Background Information

Boltovskoy, D., E. Paolucci, H. J. MacIsaac, A. Zhan, Z. Xia, and N. Correa. 2022. What we know and don't know about the invasive golden mussel *Limnoperna fortunei*. Hydrobiologia. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-022-04988-5.

Boltovskoy, D., and N. Correa. 2015. Ecosystem impacts of the invasive bivalve *Limnoperna fortunei* (golden mussel) in South America. Hydrobiologia 746:81–95.

Cataldo, D., I. O´ Farrell, E. Paolucci, F. Sylvester, and D. Boltovskoy. 2012. Impact of the invasive golden mussel (*Limnoperna fortunei*) on phytoplankton and nutrient cycling. Aquatic Invasions 7:91–100.

Darrigran, G. A., and M. C. Damborenea. 2005. A South American bioinvasion case history: *Limnoperna fortunei* (Dunker, 1857), the golden mussel. American Malacological Bulletin 20:105–112.

Moutinho, S. 2021. A Golden Menace. An invasive mussel is devastating ecosystems as it spreads through South American rivers, threating the Amazon basin. Science 374: 390-393. Available from: https://www.science.org/content/article/golden-mussels-devastating-south-american-rivers-amazon-may-be-next.

Xu, M., Z. Wang, N. Zhao, and B. Pan. 2015. Growth, reproduction, and attachment of the golden mussel (*Limnoperna fortunei*) in water diversion projects. Acta Ecologica Sinica 35:70–75.

Zhang, J., M. Xu, L. Sun, D. Reible, and X. Fu. 2022. Impact of golden mussel (*Limnoperna fortunei*) colonization on bacterial communities and potential risk to water quality. Ecological Indicators 144:109499.

Zhao, N., M. Xu, K. Blanckaert, C. Qiao, H. Zhou, and X. Niu. 2019. Study of factors influencing the invasion of Golden Mussels (*Limnoperna fortunei*) in water transfer projects. Aquatic Ecosystem Health & Management 22:385–395.

IX. Authority and Reference

Authority: Sections 2118 and 2120, California Fish and Game Code.
Reference: Sections 1002, 2116, 2118, 2118.2, 2118.4, 2119, 2120, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2150, 2190 and 2271, California Fish and Game Code.

X. Fish and Game Code Section 399 Finding

Pursuant to Section 399 of the California Fish and Game Code, the Commission finds that the readoption of this regulation is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, or general welfare.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Throughout this document, CDFW refers to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Commission refers to the California Fish and Game Commission. Unless otherwise specified, all section references in this document are to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR).

On October 17, 2024, golden mussel (*Limnoperna fortunei)*, an invasive, non-native, freshwater bivalve native to rivers and creeks of China and Southeast Asia, was discovered in the Port of Stockton, San Joaquin County, by California Department of Water Resources (DWR) staff while conducting routine operations. This was the first known occurrence of this highly invasive species in North America. Additional discoveries of golden mussel have occurred throughout the Delta and interconnected waters including the lower reach of the San Joaquin River (San Joaquin County), and at several points in the California Aqueduct including, from north-to-south, Clifton Court Forebay (Contra Costa County), Bethany Reservoir (Alameda County), O'Neill Forebay (Merced County), Dos Amigos Pumping Plant (Merced County), Pleasant Valley Pumping Plant (Fresno County), Las Perillas Pumping Plant on the Coastal Branch Aqueduct (Kings County), Check 24 (Kings County), and Lake Palmdale (Los Angeles County).

Golden mussels were likely introduced to the Port of Stockton, San Joaquin County, by a ship traveling from an international port. Golden mussel is likely to spread throughout the interconnected Delta, upstream into Delta tributaries, as far west as Suisun Bay, and southward via the State Water Project and Central Valley Project that draw water from the Delta. Without containment, golden mussel is likely to spread overland on trailered vessels and equipment to other fresh and brackish waterbodies throughout California, and to other ports and inland waters of North America, and potentially abroad.

Golden mussel is known to be established outside of its native range in Hong Kong, Japan, Taiwan, Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Argentina. Within the invaded range, significant impacts resulting from the dense colonization of golden mussels on hard surfaces are widely documented.

The presence of golden mussel poses a significant immediate threat to the ecological health of the Delta and all waters of the state, the operations of water conveyance systems, agricultural interests, hydroelectric power generation, infrastructure, water quality, and the economy. Its presence in California is of statewide, national, and international concern.

Golden mussel has a similar appearance, biology, and impact as quagga and zebra (dreissenid) mussels. Golden mussel can tolerate a wider range of environmental conditions than dreissenid mussels, including less calcium, higher salinity, and warmer water temperatures. Nearly all waters of California are conducive to golden mussel establishment.

Golden mussel is an ecosystem engineer and can profoundly change natural environments. It threatens California's infrastructure, recreation, municipal and industrial water supplies, the robust agricultural industry, and power plant operations. Millions of dollars are already spent annually to maintain infrastructure and prevent further spread of dreissenid mussels in California, and golden mussel are anticipated to increase these costs significantly.

Golden mussel can also impact recreation by limiting recreational opportunities, encrusting docks and beaches, and colonizing recreational equipment including watercraft hulls, engines, and steering components. Dreissenid mussel infestations resulted in the temporary and permanent closure of waterbodies to the public and have negatively impacted aquatic ecosystems.

CDFW and partners have been mobilizing a statewide response, including delineation of the infestation and implementing containment to prevent the further spread of golden mussel. Currently there are no federal prohibitions for possessing or moving golden mussels. Other than the currently effective emergency regulation, there are no other state prohibitions for possessing or moving golden mussels. Re-adopting the emergency regulations for golden mussel to remain on the list of restricted animals in Section 671 will continue to equip CDFW and local water managers with authority to take action to prevent the overland spread of golden mussels.

In response to the emergency situation, the proposed regulatory action readopts the amendment of Section 671 adding the golden mussel species to the list of restricted animals in new subsection 671(c)(10)(B). The proposed regulation for readoption is the same as the original emergency as well as the first 90-day readoption.

Continuing to include golden mussel on the list of restricted animals will keep in place the prohibition on importation, transportation, and possession of live golden mussels, thereby deterring people from moving them to other waters of the state and providing enforceability if golden mussels are found in someone's possession. Continuing to include golden mussel on the list of restricted animals will also allow water managers operating mussel prevention programs grounds to refuse vessels and equipment that are or suspected to be carrying golden mussels from launching into lakes, reservoirs, or other waterways where golden mussels are not known to be present. Additionally, it will allow law enforcement personnel to inspect watercraft and quarantine any vessels that are infested with golden mussels and/or detain vessels or equipment until such time as they no longer pose a threat to the environment.

Benefits of the Regulation:

The California Legislature has declared that some wild animals are a threat to native wildlife or the agricultural interests of the state and that some wild animals are a threat to public health and safety. It is the Legislature's intention that the importation, transportation and possession of wild animals be regulated to protect the native wildlife and agricultural interests of the state against damage from the existence at large of certain wild animals and to protect the health and safety in this state. The proposed regulations will help to prevent the translocation of golden mussel to other waterbodies in the state and beyond, thereby protecting native wildlife, the agricultural interests of the state and public health and safety.

Consistency and Compatibility with Existing Regulations

Article IV, Section 20 of the California Constitution specifies that the California Legislature may delegate to the Commission such powers relating to the protection and propagation of fish and game as the Legislature sees fit. The Legislature has delegated to the Commission the power to regulate the importation, transportation and possession of wild animals to protect the native wildlife, agricultural interests of the state, and the health and safety in this state (California Fish and Game Code Section 2118). The Commission has reviewed its own regulations and finds that the proposed regulations are consistent with other regulations in Title 14, CCR, and therefore finds that the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. The Commission has searched the California Code of Regulations and finds no other state agency regulations pertaining to adding golden mussel to the list of restricted animals.

Item 33

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)
Subject:	Animal welfare in South Korea - 6 letters
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:13:01 PM
Attachments:	6 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached six letters from members of the public regarding animal welfare in South Korea.

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: Hyrin kim

To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); kanglaw83@hanmail.net; sjkang2005@smc.seoul.kr; k-gimoon@hanmail.net; hiseocho@naver.com; aromaeffort@hanmail.net; smil-ing@naver.com; muse201@hotmail.com; kkhbb0331@daum.net; leejs8341@naver.com; kkd3344@hanmail.net; spoman88@naver.com; dwk5gangnam@gmail.com; visionbosco@naver.com; oki1422@naver.com; kimyc5975@naver.com; yongk0525@hanmail.net; pukasun011@hanmail.net; kwj22222@naver.com; kim22wt@naver.com; ij7857@gmail.com; k80209454@hanmail.net; 220601winner@naver.com; sujihoo@hanmail.net; gare1@hanmail.net; kts8104@hanmail.net; hyeon4123@hanmail.net; kign0071@naver.com; khyseoul7@daum.net; bombam111@naver.com; jnd0522@hanmail.net; chjin4455@nate.com; mydoh@naver.com; nayuri89@naver.com; Mbj1440@naver.com; ksp9725@naver.com; shp2022@naver.com; parksuk7@hanmail.net; syannie@naver.com; 101gangbuk@gmail.com; sjpark5272@hanmail.net; myjjang55@hanmail.net; maum7412@naver.com; pjhkorworld@hanmail.net; csp2000@naver.com; seven7star77@hanmail.net; gox9778@nate.com; yeol1977@naver.com; ricehope@hanmail.net; sho3120@hanmail.net; zxy100@naver.com; mountain8511@naver.com; skt007@naver.com; songdoho88@naver.com; ecopolis2050@hanmail.net; flutelove2001@hanmail.net; bj618@hanmail.net; meiqing7@nate.com; kantry1@smc.seoul.kr; bmwohkr@naver.com; oje1015@hanmail.net; joinus7942@daum.net; kfmpd@naver.com; yumanhee@hanmail.net; yjhm8144@naver.com; dorimchun@hanmail.net; ds1msm@hanmail.net; etty02@smc.seoul.kr; yoonjb48@naver.com; lks7459@naver.com; min12343@naver.com; 2min5gi@naver.com; lover9474@naver.com; kee61k@empas.com; bjkmc@naver.com; seoul7635@gmail.com; teamleesanghoon@naver.com; zzz1895@naver.com; 113lee@naver.com; sora94seoul@gmail.com; sjl0894@hanmail.net; sm6244@naver.com; marinespyi@naver.com; dndsil@hanmail.net; st2020@hanmail.net; yiwh2898@naver.com; eunlim@ewhain.net; jongbae1252@daum.net; smilemen@hanmail.net; ljh5612@hanmail.net; seoul.lhw@gmail.com; archicbnu@naver.com; kcnljw@hanmail.net; sangchoo1900@hanmail.net; eparty@paran.com; cnseo566@naver.com; samueladams@naver.com; bjjeon918@hanmail.net; 준. 정; jw9976@naver.com; chaemokdong@gmail.com; gichan6907@hanmail.net; minkyu0307@naver.com; choi_767@naver.com; inpraxis@naver.com; cjinh2261@naver.com; fng9129@hanmail.net; han-shin@naver.com; yangcheongo@naver.com; cp1055@naver.com; lovejane26@hanmail.net; hck01@hanmail.net; ENGLISH@assembly.go.kr; webmaster@assembly.go.kr; 015miae@naver.com; 0415gunsan@gmail.com; syd@assembly.go.kr; 1bddoit@gmail.com; 22.ksunmin@gmail.com; 326miae@gmail.com; 734ssj@gmail.com; 7842055@naver.com; assemblymoonsu@gmail.com; ayjk1101@gmail.com; bemil434@naver.com; changit@naver.com; choo_worl d@naver.com; chung10park@naver.com; dcparkjj@assembly.go.kr; dh337dh@naver.com; dj_koh7163@naver.com; eonju5257@gmail.com; gimpolovekjy@gmail.com; greenwind21@gmail.com; hangkim74@assembly.go.kr; happyhappo@naver.com; ilovebusanjin@hanmail.net; j7840790@gmail.com; jee21dongnae@naver.com; jeoung@gmail.com; jhkang315@gmail.com; jhkim1789@naver.com; jinjongoh.official@gmail.com; jjhgj0503@naver.com; jmoon123@naver.com; jongno.kwak@gmail.com; joo_jinwoo@naver.com; joonforpeace@gmail.com; jsh35351@naver.com; jsjeong0403@naver.com; jskshare2020@gmail.com; jungsdream24@gmail.com; jwk@rebuildingk.kr; jykimm61@assembly.go.kr; kimjungho3359@daum.net; kktlaw@naver.com; kts230410@gmail.com; letskt2020@gmail.com; limhoseon2020@naver.com; llj11@daum.net; lok0415@hanmail.net; napark81@naver.com; official_yt@naver.com; okhyung628@naver.com; parkdukhyum@naver.com; pbk705@naver.com; pksjoffice@naver.com; sbyoo64@naver.com; smpark3340@naver.com; unhah0301@gmail.com; vsbok@naver.com; woooo617@naver.com; ydkim22@naver.com; yjb870053@naver.com; yoons609@hanmail.net; youngjink840@naver.com; youngkyos@naver.com; yskys2020@naver.com; zeeahan635@gmail.com; 2024iccho@gmail.com; 2024wisunglac@gmail.com; 2040jd@gmail.com; 22yyh620@naver.com; 2yangs6288@naver.com; 335kang@naver.com; 3s0011@naver.com; 518jjs@naver.com; 532jhlee@gmail.com; 613jjs@gmail.com; 623kimjk@gmail.com; 7842760@naver.com; 7844165@naver.com; 7844861@naver.com; 7880291@naver.com; 7882576kj@hanmail.net; 7882579@naver.com; 907kth@naver.com; ahndogeol@naver.com; ahnho065@gmail.com; anotherk7@gmail.com; antagt@naver.com; anyangmin@gmail.com; assembly0915@naver.com; assembly847@naver.com; bakeunjeong22@gmail.com; best1yty@gmail.com; bhrassembly0217@gmail.com; bigmann64@naver.com; bjh438@naver.com; booseungchan.yongin@gmail.com; braveplane@gmail.com; bsa_teacher@naver.com; can929292@naver.com; cdypeace@hanmail.net; cesof@naver.com; chajiho5301@gmail.com; chhi.address@gma il.com; choimh867@gmail.com; choiwakeup@gmail.com; chokuk@assembly.go.kr; chungco518@gmail.com; csa2418@naver.com; csahn435@gmail.com; csh240410@naver.com; dalhee621@naver.com; dobongstar24@naver.com; dongah1021@gmail.com; dongbu1538@naver.com; dskimbless@naver.com; dw7227@naver.com; flyhong21@naver.com; fopeopler76@gmail.com; gangseo.kap@gmail.com; gikuchon@nate.com; gimpo_park@naver.com; gkim338@naver.com; goanghee1@naver.com; gohoonsik@gmail.com; gracecho1@naver.com; gracesook52@rebuildingk.kr; guseng@hanmail.net; gyewoncho@naver.com; heeyong4you@naver.com; hello@yonghyein.kr; hjyun9292@naver.com; hmsgb2024@gmail.com; hoongi2024@gmail.com; hotjjoon@gmail.com; newds61@naver.com; huhsmsm@naver.com; hwang_0410@naver.com; hwanghee6728@gmail.com; hwangms0@naver.com; indobangrang@hanmail.net; inseon0502@naver.com; intoan429@gmail.com; ironkwon24@gmail.com; ironregion24@gmail.com; jaeganglee@gmail.com; jassembly536@gmail.com; jcm5440@gmail.com; jeonjd7877@gmail.com; jinhae.jump@gmail.co m; jiyeonwecan@naver.com; jongsyy@naver.com; joomincenter@gmail.com; jth5073@gmail.com; juno.news2020@gmail.com; jwp615@naver.com; jyb116@naver.com; jylee_nrp@naver.com; kds21341@naver.com; khchoo@assembly.go.kr; khjkorea@assembly.go.kr; khyungdong@naver.com; kimbyungjoo62@gmail.com; kimeunhye_official@naver.com; kimeunpyung0@gmail.com; kimhyun0610@gmail.com; kiminnotank@naver.com; kimkh4u@naver.com; kimnowongu@gmail.com; kimsangwook80@naver.com; kimsg5358@naver.com; kimsw910@naver.com; kimwoni923@gmail.com; kim-youngho@naver.com; kiyku@naver.com; knh@na.go.kr; kominjung21@gmail.com; ksdd22@naver.com; kshdg11@gmail.com; kshoi72@naver.com; kskangsk@na.go.kr; ktn0320@daum.net; kyjtongil@naver.com;

law@bychoi.com; lawjj@naver.com; ldek3525@naver.com; leehaesik1113@gmail.com; leejjlaw@gmail.com; leesang@assembly.go.kr; leesj545@daum.net; limkhassembly@gmail.com; liy1964@empal.com; ljm631000@assembly.go.kr; ljm935@na.go.kr; lkh502503@gmail.com; lsywin445@gmail.com; m2hwaseo@gmail.com; mains ail440@daum.net; mapo_cho@naver.com; maumgil88@gmail.com; mgk2224@naver.com; mhb1961@naver.com; minjoo_ljk0410@naver.com; minjoomsk@naver.com; minkyucool@assembly.go.kr; moalarm2024@naver.com; moondaelim@naver.com; moongj67@gmail.com; mp_sj322@naver.com; mrleegt@gmail.com; myounggu.power@gmail.com; nakw63@naver.com; namgeunkim10@gmail.com; newkms2030@gmail.com; newwonju643@naver.com; nisoon@na.go.kr; ontoincha22@gmail.com; oshee0530@gmail.com; parkcd0214@gmail.com; parkhs2024@gmail.com; parkkyoontaek@naver.com; parksm2028@gmail.com; parksw2789@naver.com; peacesong1@naver.com; pjkorea21c@naver.com; plz.hongbae@gmail.com; psyfor2020@naver.com; ptgotogether@naver.com; pyk393329@gmail.com; qkrsw20@naver.com; reform1-1@hanmail.net; saeng0425@rebuildingk.kr; sahalsk1015@naver.com; saminhcm@gmail.com; saseyoung@naver.com; sbsulju@daum.net; shinjh744@naver.com; shinjs6411@gmail.com; shkay73@naver.com; shyoon@na.go.kr; sij5140@naver.com; sijkorea@gmail.com; sjbong4381@naver.com; smjingogo@gmail.com; songok4740@naver.com; sonms@assembly.go.kr; sotong848@daum.net; ssaribi0415@naver.com; strongwind01@naver.com; successhuh@gmail.com; sungkook337@naver.com; swkimsuwon@gmail.com; sylee0546@gmail.com; team1000haram@gmail.com; teampark2024@gmail.com; the.kim.weapon@gmail.com; the.kimyoon@gmail.com; tjcjsgh2024@naver.com; together.eut@gmail.com; ubuntu_21@naver.com; victory_cho@naver.com; victoryljb@naver.com; we1taeg@daum.net; winner4011@naver.com; wishjeju@hanmail.net; withmin413@gmail.com; wjseo21@rebuildingk.kr; worker21c@gmail.com; yangmunsuk7227@gmail.com; yb7841521@gmail.com; ybn733@naver.com; yc20002@naver.com; yeajijoy@gmail.com; yeskt@hanmail.net; yhassembly2024@naver.com; yjongo428@gmail.com; ymk0814@naver.com; youngcamp1@gmail.com; younky926@gmail.com; yslee9282@naver.com; yujung7522@gmail.com; yuseong0413@daum.net; kimgipyo24@naver.com; jeehye.park@assembly.go.kr; yeonh2ee@gmail.com; lywchosim@naver.com; assembly_ok@naver.com; ash_0515@naver.com; haimin@rebuildingk.kr; wisangk@naver.com; yesbupyeong@gmail.com; new_ansan@naver.com; kilee905@naver.com; sotong0743@gmail.com; jhkjinbo@gmail.com; sbumshin@naver.com; songpapjh22@naver.com; hangh21@naver.com

Subject: Urgent International Appeal: End Tethering and Prevent Wildfire Tragedies in Seoul, South Korea

Date: Friday, July 25, 2025 2:32:05 PM

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

Dear Mayor Daniel Lurie and Esteemed Representatives of San Francisco,

I write to you with a heavy heart and an urgent plea for compassion. In Seoul, South Korea —your Sister City—dogs continue to suffer and die in ways that shock the conscience.

Despite South Korea's recent Manual for the Rescue and Protection of Companion Animals During Natural Disasters (May 2025), there are still no laws that truly protect these innocent lives. The manual is purely advisory, with no legal force to ensure animals are rescued in emergencies. Even worse, the barbaric practice of lifelong tethering remains completely legal, condemning countless dogs to a life of loneliness, filth, and chains barely long enough to turn around.

Time and again, wildfires sweep through these regions, leaving terrified, tethered dogs to face the flames alone. They are burned alive, forgotten, voiceless, and treated as disposable property. This is a moral catastrophe that demands action.

As leaders of Seoul's Sister City, you have a unique power—and responsibility—to speak out. I implore you to:

1. Publicly denounce the cruelty of lifelong tethering and the abandonment of animals during disasters. Silence allows this suffering to continue.

2. Reach out directly to your counterparts in Seoul. Share your deep concern and urge them to enact binding laws that end tethering and guarantee companion animals are evacuated alongside their families.

3. Support critical national reforms in South Korea, including:

- A complete, enforceable ban on lifelong tethering.
- Mandatory evacuation protocols for companion animals.
- Real penalties for abandonment and neglect, especially during emergencies.
- Public campaigns that teach empathy and responsible care.

4. Offer San Francisco's partnership and resources, whether through expertise in humane disaster planning or joint initiatives that show what true sisterhood between cities can mean.

Please, take a moment to see the faces behind this tragedy (warning: deeply disturbing content):

- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/m0FWFjIfbC8
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/7vZE_P_wGho
- https://koreandogs.org/700-dogs-burned-alive/
- https://koreandogs.org/bbibbi/
- https://koreandogs.org/charles/
- https://koreandogs.org/daepoong/
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/sbUi7K9mPTU
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/sStj0hH6MyM
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/A8OskdtJvjg
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/BfEbt6s79sE
- https://youtu.be/MunZMwl6BmQ
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/hRocjMfllqM
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/hotkDKh8Ii8
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/SJ-bYNdeS6I
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/CeTa4VRG6pk
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/9Bway6u5sb4
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/cDWUTYsVQHQ
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/_LjaYeZkrQU
- https://koreandogs.org/two-brothers-rescued/
- https://koreandogs.org/uljin-fire/
- https://koreandogs.org/gangwondo-fire/
- https://koreandogs.org/danbi/
- https://koreandogs.org/chungju-fire/
- https://www.youtube.com/@TheFromcare/streams

Change is possible. South Korea has opened the door—but only strong, enforceable laws will put an end to this horror. As Seoul's Sister City, San Francisco's voice carries immense weight. Please use it to stand up for those who cannot beg for help themselves.

A global petition is growing: https://chng.it/dxkJTfLcLw. Let this be the moment when international friendship saves lives—not just human lives, but countless loyal, loving animals who depend entirely on our mercy.

With deep respect, urgency, and hope for your leadership,

Thank you,

Hyerin Kim

Sunnyvale, CA

From: Pier Giorgio Nicoletti

To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); kanglaw83@hanmail.net; sjkang2005@smc.seoul.kr; k-gimoon@hanmail.net; hiseocho@naver.com; aromaeffort@hanmail.net; smil-ing@naver.com; muse201@hotmail.com; kkhbb0331@daum.net; leejs8341@naver.com; kkd3344@hanmail.net; spoman88@naver.com; dwk5gangnam@gmail.com; visionbosco@naver.com; oki1422@naver.com; kimyc5975@naver.com; yongk0525@hanmail.net; pukasun011@hanmail.net; kwj22222@naver.com; kim22wt@naver.com; ij7857@gmail.com; k80209454@hanmail.net; 220601winner@naver.com; sujihoo@hanmail.net; gare1@hanmail.net; kts8104@hanmail.net; hyeon4123@hanmail.net; kign0071@naver.com; khyseoul7@daum.net; bombam111@naver.com; jnd0522@hanmail.net; chjin4455@nate.com; mydoh@naver.com; nayuri89@naver.com; Mbj1440@naver.com; ksp9725@naver.com; shp2022@naver.com; parksuk7@hanmail.net; syannie@naver.com; 101gangbuk@gmail.com; sjpark5272@hanmail.net; myjjang55@hanmail.net; maum7412@naver.com; pjhkorworld@hanmail.net; csp2000@naver.com; seven7star77@hanmail.net; gox9778@nate.com; yeol1977@naver.com; ricehope@hanmail.net; sho3120@hanmail.net; zxy100@naver.com; mountain8511@naver.com; skt007@naver.com; songdoho88@naver.com; ecopolis2050@hanmail.net; flutelove2001@hanmail.net; bj618@hanmail.net; meiqing7@nate.com; kantry1@smc.seoul.kr; bmwohkr@naver.com; oje1015@hanmail.net; joinus7942@daum.net; kfmpd@naver.com; yumanhee@hanmail.net; yjhm8144@naver.com; dorimchun@hanmail.net; ds1msm@hanmail.net; etty02@smc.seoul.kr; yoonjb48@naver.com; lks7459@naver.com; min12343@naver.com; 2min5gi@naver.com; lover9474@naver.com; kee61k@empas.com; bjkmc@naver.com; seoul7635@gmail.com; teamleesanghoon@naver.com; zzz1895@naver.com; 113lee@naver.com; sora94seoul@gmail.com; sjl0894@hanmail.net; sm6244@naver.com; marinespyi@naver.com; dndsil@hanmail.net; st2020@hanmail.net; yiwh2898@naver.com; eunlim@ewhain.net; jongbae1252@daum.net; smilemen@hanmail.net; ljh5612@hanmail.net; seoul.lhw@gmail.com; archicbnu@naver.com; kcnljw@hanmail.net; sangchoo1900@hanmail.net; eparty@paran.com; cnseo566@naver.com; samueladams@naver.com; bjjeon918@hanmail.net; 준. 정; jw9976@naver.com; chaemokdong@gmail.com; gichan6907@hanmail.net; minkyu0307@naver.com; choi_767@naver.com; inpraxis@naver.com; cjinh2261@naver.com; fng9129@hanmail.net; han-shin@naver.com; yangcheongo@naver.com; cp1055@naver.com; lovejane26@hanmail.net; hck01@hanmail.net; ENGLISH@assembly.go.kr; webmaster@assembly.go.kr; 015miae@naver.com; 0415gunsan@gmail.com; syd@assembly.go.kr; 1bddoit@gmail.com; 22.ksunmin@gmail.com; 326miae@gmail.com; 734ssj@gmail.com; 7842055@naver.com; assemblymoonsu@gmail.com; ayjk1101@gmail.com; bemil434@naver.com; changit@naver.com; choo_worl d@naver.com; chung10park@naver.com; dcparkjj@assembly.go.kr; dh337dh@naver.com; dj_koh7163@naver.com; eonju5257@gmail.com; gimpolovekjy@gmail.com; greenwind21@gmail.com; hangkim74@assembly.go.kr; happyhappo@naver.com; ilovebusanjin@hanmail.net; j7840790@gmail.com; jee21dongnae@naver.com; jeoung@gmail.com; jhkang315@gmail.com; jhkim1789@naver.com; jinjongoh.official@gmail.com; jjhgj0503@naver.com; jmoon123@naver.com; jongno.kwak@gmail.com; joo_jinwoo@naver.com; joonforpeace@gmail.com; jsh35351@naver.com; jsjeong0403@naver.com; jskshare2020@gmail.com; jungsdream24@gmail.com; jwk@rebuildingk.kr; jykimm61@assembly.go.kr; kimjungho3359@daum.net; kktlaw@naver.com; kts230410@gmail.com; letskt2020@gmail.com; limhoseon2020@naver.com; llj11@daum.net; lok0415@hanmail.net; napark81@naver.com; official_yt@naver.com; okhyung628@naver.com; parkdukhyum@naver.com; pbk705@naver.com; pksjoffice@naver.com; sbyoo64@naver.com; smpark3340@naver.com; unhah0301@gmail.com; vsbok@naver.com; woooo617@naver.com; ydkim22@naver.com; yjb870053@naver.com; yoons609@hanmail.net; youngjink840@naver.com; youngkyos@naver.com; yskys2020@naver.com; zeeahan635@gmail.com; 2024iccho@gmail.com; 2024wisunglac@gmail.com; 2040jd@gmail.com; 22yyh620@naver.com; 2yangs6288@naver.com; 335kang@naver.com; 3s0011@naver.com; 518jjs@naver.com; 532jhlee@gmail.com; 613jjs@gmail.com; 623kimjk@gmail.com; 7842760@naver.com; 7844165@naver.com; 7844861@naver.com; 7880291@naver.com; 7882576kj@hanmail.net; 7882579@naver.com; 907kth@naver.com; ahndogeol@naver.com; ahnho065@gmail.com; anotherk7@gmail.com; antagt@naver.com; anyangmin@gmail.com; assembly0915@naver.com; assembly847@naver.com; bakeunjeong22@gmail.com; best1yty@gmail.com; bhrassembly0217@gmail.com; bigmann64@naver.com; bjh438@naver.com; booseungchan.yongin@gmail.com; braveplane@gmail.com; bsa_teacher@naver.com; can929292@naver.com; cdypeace@hanmail.net; cesof@naver.com; chajiho5301@gmail.com; chhi.address@gma il.com; choimh867@gmail.com; choiwakeup@gmail.com; chokuk@assembly.go.kr; chungco518@gmail.com; csa2418@naver.com; csahn435@gmail.com; csh240410@naver.com; dalhee621@naver.com; dobongstar24@naver.com; dongah1021@gmail.com; dongbu1538@naver.com; dskimbless@naver.com; dw7227@naver.com; flyhong21@naver.com; fopeopler76@gmail.com; gangseo.kap@gmail.com; gikuchon@nate.com; gimpo_park@naver.com; gkim338@naver.com; goanghee1@naver.com; gohoonsik@gmail.com; gracecho1@naver.com; gracesook52@rebuildingk.kr; guseng@hanmail.net; gyewoncho@naver.com; heeyong4you@naver.com; hello@yonghyein.kr; hjyun9292@naver.com; hmsgb2024@gmail.com; hoongi2024@gmail.com; hotjjoon@gmail.com; newds61@naver.com; huhsmsm@naver.com; hwang_0410@naver.com; hwanghee6728@gmail.com; hwangms0@naver.com; indobangrang@hanmail.net; inseon0502@naver.com; intoan429@gmail.com; ironkwon24@gmail.com; ironregion24@gmail.com; jaeganglee@gmail.com; jassembly536@gmail.com; jcm5440@gmail.com; jeonjd7877@gmail.com; jinhae.jump@gmail.co m; jiyeonwecan@naver.com; jongsyy@naver.com; joomincenter@gmail.com; jth5073@gmail.com; juno.news2020@gmail.com; jwp615@naver.com; jyb116@naver.com; jylee_nrp@naver.com; kds21341@naver.com; khchoo@assembly.go.kr; khjkorea@assembly.go.kr; khyungdong@naver.com; kimbyungjoo62@gmail.com; kimeunhye_official@naver.com; kimeunpyung0@gmail.com; kimhyun0610@gmail.com; kiminnotank@naver.com; kimkh4u@naver.com; kimnowongu@gmail.com; kimsangwook80@naver.com; kimsg5358@naver.com; kimsw910@naver.com; kimwoni923@gmail.com; kim-youngho@naver.com; kiyku@naver.com; knh@na.go.kr; kominjung21@gmail.com; ksdd22@naver.com; kshdg11@gmail.com; kshoi72@naver.com; kskangsk@na.go.kr; ktn0320@daum.net; kyjtongil@naver.com;

law@bychoi.com; lawjj@naver.com; ldek3525@naver.com; leehaesik1113@gmail.com; leejjlaw@gmail.com; leesang@assembly.go.kr; leesj545@daum.net; limkhassembly@gmail.com; liy1964@empal.com; ljm631000@assembly.go.kr; ljm935@na.go.kr; lkh502503@gmail.com; lsywin445@gmail.com; m2hwaseo@gmail.com; mains ail440@daum.net; mapo_cho@naver.com; maumgil88@gmail.com; mgk2224@naver.com; mhb1961@naver.com; minjoo_ljk0410@naver.com; minjoomsk@naver.com; minkyucool@assembly.go.kr; moalarm2024@naver.com; moondaelim@naver.com; moongj67@gmail.com; mp_sj322@naver.com; mrleegt@gmail.com; myounggu.power@gmail.com; nakw63@naver.com; namgeunkim10@gmail.com; newkms2030@gmail.com; newwonju643@naver.com; nisoon@na.go.kr; ontoincha22@gmail.com; oshee0530@gmail.com; parkcd0214@gmail.com; parkhs2024@gmail.com; parkkyoontaek@naver.com; parksm2028@gmail.com; parksw2789@naver.com; peacesong1@naver.com; pjkorea21c@naver.com; plz.hongbae@gmail.com; psyfor2020@naver.com; ptgotogether@naver.com; pyk393329@gmail.com; qkrsw20@naver.com; reform1-1@hanmail.net; saeng0425@rebuildingk.kr; sahalsk1015@naver.com; saminhcm@gmail.com; saseyoung@naver.com; sbsulju@daum.net; shinjh744@naver.com; shinjs6411@gmail.com; shkay73@naver.com; shyoon@na.go.kr; sij5140@naver.com; sijkorea@gmail.com; sjbong4381@naver.com; smjingogo@gmail.com; songok4740@naver.com; sonms@assembly.go.kr; sotong848@daum.net; ssaribi0415@naver.com; strongwind01@naver.com; successhuh@gmail.com; sungkook337@naver.com; swkimsuwon@gmail.com; sylee0546@gmail.com; team1000haram@gmail.com; teampark2024@gmail.com; the.kim.weapon@gmail.com; the.kimyoon@gmail.com; tjcjsgh2024@naver.com; together.eut@gmail.com; ubuntu_21@naver.com; victory_cho@naver.com; victoryljb@naver.com; we1taeg@daum.net; winner4011@naver.com; wishjeju@hanmail.net; withmin413@gmail.com; wjseo21@rebuildingk.kr; worker21c@gmail.com; yangmunsuk7227@gmail.com; yb7841521@gmail.com; ybn733@naver.com; yc20002@naver.com; yeajijoy@gmail.com; yeskt@hanmail.net; yhassembly2024@naver.com; yjongo428@gmail.com; ymk0814@naver.com; youngcamp1@gmail.com; younky926@gmail.com; yslee9282@naver.com; yujung7522@gmail.com; yuseong0413@daum.net; kimgipyo24@naver.com; jeehye.park@assembly.go.kr; yeonh2ee@gmail.com; lywchosim@naver.com; assembly_ok@naver.com; ash_0515@naver.com; haimin@rebuildingk.kr; wisangk@naver.com; yesbupyeong@gmail.com; new_ansan@naver.com; kilee905@naver.com; sotong0743@gmail.com; jhkjinbo@gmail.com; sbumshin@naver.com; songpapjh22@naver.com; hangh21@naver.com

Subject: Urgent International Appeal: End Tethering and Prevent Wildfire Tragedies in Seoul, South Korea

Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 2:01:19 AM

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

Dear Mayor Daniel Lurie and Esteemed Representatives of San Francisco,

I write to you with a heavy heart and an urgent plea for compassion. In Seoul, South Korea —your Sister City—dogs continue to suffer and die in ways that shock the conscience.

Despite South Korea's recent Manual for the Rescue and Protection of Companion Animals During Natural Disasters (May 2025), there are still no laws that truly protect these innocent lives. The manual is purely advisory, with no legal force to ensure animals are rescued in emergencies. Even worse, the barbaric practice of lifelong tethering remains completely legal, condemning countless dogs to a life of loneliness, filth, and chains barely long enough to turn around.

Time and again, wildfires sweep through these regions, leaving terrified, tethered dogs to face the flames alone. They are burned alive, forgotten, voiceless, and treated as disposable property. This is a moral catastrophe that demands action.

As leaders of Seoul's Sister City, you have a unique power—and responsibility—to speak out. I implore you to:

1. Publicly denounce the cruelty of lifelong tethering and the abandonment of animals during disasters. Silence allows this suffering to continue.

2. Reach out directly to your counterparts in Seoul. Share your deep concern and urge them to enact binding laws that end tethering and guarantee companion animals are evacuated alongside their families.

3. Support critical national reforms in South Korea, including:

- A complete, enforceable ban on lifelong tethering.
- Mandatory evacuation protocols for companion animals.
- Real penalties for abandonment and neglect, especially during emergencies.
- Public campaigns that teach empathy and responsible care.

4. Offer San Francisco's partnership and resources, whether through expertise in humane disaster planning or joint initiatives that show what true sisterhood between cities can mean.

Please, take a moment to see the faces behind this tragedy (warning: deeply disturbing content):

- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/m0FWFjIfbC8
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/7vZE_P_wGho
- https://koreandogs.org/700-dogs-burned-alive/
- https://koreandogs.org/bbibbi/
- https://koreandogs.org/charles/
- https://koreandogs.org/daepoong/
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/sbUi7K9mPTU
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/sStj0hH6MyM
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/A8OskdtJvjg
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/BfEbt6s79sE
- https://youtu.be/MunZMwl6BmQ
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/hRocjMfllqM
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/hotkDKh8Ii8
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/SJ-bYNdeS6I
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/CeTa4VRG6pk
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/9Bway6u5sb4
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/cDWUTYsVQHQ
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/_LjaYeZkrQU
- https://koreandogs.org/two-brothers-rescued/
- https://koreandogs.org/uljin-fire/
- https://koreandogs.org/gangwondo-fire/
- https://koreandogs.org/danbi/
- https://koreandogs.org/chungju-fire/
- https://www.youtube.com/@TheFromcare/streams

Change is possible. South Korea has opened the door—but only strong, enforceable laws will put an end to this horror. As Seoul's Sister City, San Francisco's voice carries immense weight. Please use it to stand up for those who cannot beg for help themselves.

A global petition is growing: https://chng.it/dxkJTfLcLw. Let this be the moment when international friendship saves lives—not just human lives, but countless loyal, loving animals who depend entirely on our mercy.

With deep respect, urgency, and hope for your leadership,

Pier Giorgio NICOLETTI
Via S. Maria Capua Vetere, 26
81043 Capua (CE)
Italy

From: Andrea S.

To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)

Cc: kanglaw83@hanmail.net; sjkang2005@smc.seoul.kr; k-gimoon@hanmail.net; hiseocho@naver.com; aromaeffort@hanmail.net; smil-ing@naver.com; muse201@hotmail.com; kkhbb0331@daum.net; leejs8341@naver.com; kkd3344@hanmail.net; spoman88@naver.com; dwk5gangnam@gmail.com; visionbosco@naver.com; oki1422@naver.com; kimyc5975@naver.com; yongk0525@hanmail.net; pukasun011@hanmail.net; kwj22222@naver.com; kim22wt@naver.com; ij7857@gmail.com; k80209454@hanmail.net; 220601winner@naver.com; sujihoo@hanmail.net; gare1@hanmail.net; kts8104@hanmail.net; hyeon4123@hanmail.net; kign0071@naver.com; khyseoul7@daum.net; bombam111@naver.com; jnd0522@hanmail.net; chjin4455@nate.com; mydoh@naver.com; nayuri89@naver.com; Mbj1440@naver.com; ksp9725@naver.com; shp2022@naver.com; parksuk7@hanmail.net; syannie@naver.com; 101gangbuk@gmail.com; sjpark5272@hanmail.net; myjjang55@hanmail.net; maum7412@naver.com; pjhkorworld@hanmail.net; csp2000@naver.com; seven7star77@hanmail.net; gox9778@nate.com; yeol1977@naver.com; r_icehope@hanmail.net; sho3120@hanmail.net; zxy100@naver.com; mountain8511@naver.com; skt007@naver.com; songdoho88@naver.com; ecopolis2050@hanmail.net; flutelove2001@hanmail.net; bj618@hanmail.net; meiqing7@nate.com; kantry1@smc.seoul.kr; bmwohkr@naver.com; oje1015@hanmail.net; joinus7942@daum.net; kfmpd@naver.com; yumanhee@hanmail.net; yjhm8144@naver.com; dorimchun@hanmail.net; ds1msm@hanmail.net; etty02@smc.seoul.kr; yoonjb48@naver.com; lks7459@naver.com; min12343@naver.com; 2min5gi@naver.com; lover9474@naver.com; kee61k@empas.com; bjkmc@naver.com; seoul7635@gmail.com; teamleesanghoon@naver.com; zzz1895@naver.com; 113lee@naver.com; sora94seoul@gmail.com; sjl0894@hanmail.net; sm6244@naver.com; marinespyi@naver.com; dndsil@hanmail.net; st2020@hanmail.net; yiwh2898@naver.com; eunlim@ewhain.net; jongbae1252@daum.net; smilemen@hanmail.net; ljh5612@hanmail.net; seoul.lhw@gmail.com; archicbnu@naver.com; kcnljw@hanmail.net; sangchoo1900@hanmail.net; eparty@paran.com; cnseo566@naver.com; samueladams@naver.com; bjjeon918@hanmail.net; 준. 정; jw9976@naver.com; chaemokdong@gmail.com; gichan6907@hanmail.net; minkyu0307@naver.com; choi_767@naver.com; inpraxis@naver.com; cjinh2261@naver.com; fng9129@hanmail.net; han-shin@naver.com; yangcheongo@naver.com; cp1055@naver.com; lovejane26@hanmail.net; hck01@hanmail.net; ENGLISH@assembly.go.kr; webmaster@assembly.go.kr; 015miae@naver.com; 0415gunsan@gmail.com; syd@assembly.go.kr; 1bddoit@gmail.com; 22.ksunmin@gmail.com; 326miae@gmail.com; 734ssj@gmail.com; 7842055@naver.com; assemblymoonsu@gmail.com; ayjk1101@gmail.com; bemil434@naver.com; changit@naver.com; choo_world@naver.com; chung10park@naver.com; dcparkjj@assembly.go.kr; dh337dh@naver.com; dj_koh7163@naver.com; eonju5257@gmail.com; gimpolovekjy@gmail.com; greenwind21@gmail.com; hangkim74@assembly.go.kr; happyhappo@naver.com; ilovebusanjin@hanmail.net; j7840790@gmail.com; jee21dongnae@naver.com; jeou_ng@gmail.com; jhkang315@gmail.com; jhkim1789@naver.com; jinjongoh.official@gmail.com; jjhgj0503@naver.com; jmoon123@naver.com; jongno.kwak@gmail.com; joo_jinwoo@naver.com; joonforpeace@gmail.com; jsh35351@naver.com; jsjeong0403@naver.com; jskshare2020@gmail.com; jungsdream24@gmail.com; jwk@rebuildingk.kr; jykimm61@assembly.go.kr; kimjungho3359@daum.net; kktlaw@naver.com; kts230410@gmail.com; letskt2020@gmail.com; limhoseon2020@naver.com; llj11@daum.net; lok0415@hanmail.net; napark81@naver.com; official_yt@naver.com; okhyung628@naver.com; parkdukhyum@naver.com; pbk705@naver.com; pksjoffice@naver.com; sbyoo64@naver.com; smpark3340@naver.com; unhah0301@gmail.com; vsbok@naver.com; woooo617@naver.com; ydkim22@naver.com; yjb870053@naver.com; yoons609@hanmail.net; youngjink840@naver.com; youngkyos@naver.com; yskys2020@naver.com; zeeahan635@gmail.com; 2024iccho@gmail.com; 2024wisunglac@gmail.com; 2040jd@gmail.com; 22yyh620@naver.com; 2yangs6288@naver.com; 335kang@naver.com; 3s0011@naver.com; 518jjs@naver.com; 532jhlee@gmail.com; 613jjs@gmail.com; 623kimjk@gmail.com; 7842760@naver.com; 7844165@naver.com; 7844861@naver.com; 7880291@naver.com; 7882576kj@hanmail.net; 7882579@naver.com; 907kth@naver.com; ahndogeol@naver.com; ahnho065@gmail.com; anotherk7@gmail.com; antagt@naver.com; anyangmin@gmail.com; assembly0915@naver.com; assembly847@naver.com; bakeunjeong22@gmail.com; best1yty@gmail.com; bhrassembly0217@gmail.com; bigmann64@naver.com; bjh438@naver.com; booseungchan.yongin@gmail.com; braveplane@gmail.com; bsa_teacher@naver.com; can929292@naver.com; cdypeace@hanmail.net; cesof@naver.com; chajiho5301@gmail.com; chhi.address@gmail.com; choimh867@gmail.com; choiwakeup@gmail.com; chokuk@assembly.go.kr; chungco518@gmail.com; csa2418@naver.com; csahn435@gmail.com; csh240410@naver.com; dalhee621@naver.com; dobongstar24@naver.com; dongah1021@gmail.com; dongbu1538@naver.com; dskimbless@naver.com; dw7227@naver.com; flyhong21@naver.com; fopeopler76@gmail.com; gangseo.kap@gmail.com; gikuchon@nate.com; gimpo_park@naver.com; gkim338@naver.com; goanghee1@naver.com; gohoonsik@gmail.com; gracecho1@naver.com; gracesook52@rebuildingk.kr; guseng@hanmail.net; gyewoncho@naver.com; heeyong4you@naver.com; hello@yonghyein.kr; hjyun9292@naver.com; hmsgb2024@gmail.com; hoongi2024@gmail.com; hotjjoon@gmail.com; newds61@naver.com; huhsmsm@naver.com; hwang_0410@naver.com; hwanghee6728@gmail.com; hwangms0@naver.com; indobangrang@hanmail.net; inseon0502@naver.com; intoan429@gmail.com; ironkwon24@gmail.com; ironregion24@gmail.com; jaeganglee@gmail.com; jassembly536@gmail.com; jcm5440@gmail.com; jeonjd7877@gmail.com; jinhae.jump@gmail.com; jiyeonwecan@naver.com; jongsyy@naver.com; joomincenter@gmail.com; jth5073@gmail.com; juno.news2020@gmail.com; jwp615@naver.com; jyb116@naver.com; jylee_nrp@naver.com; kds21341@naver.com; khchoo@assembly.go.kr; khjkorea@assembly.go.kr; khyungdong@naver.com; kimbyungjoo62@gmail.com; kimeunhye_official@naver.com; kimeunpyung0@gmail.com; kimhyun0610@gmail.com; kiminnotank@naver.com; kimkh4u@naver.com; kimnowongu@gmail.com; kimsangwook80@naver.com; kimsg5358@naver.com; kimsw910@naver.com; kimwoni923@gmail.com; kim-

youngho@naver.com; kiyku@naver.com; knh@na.go.kr; kominjung21@gmail.com; ksdd22@naver.com; kshdg11@gmail.com; kshoi72@naver.com; kskangsk@na.go.kr; ktn0320@daum.net; kyjtongil@naver.com; law@bychoi.com; lawjj@naver.com; ldek3525@naver.com; leehaesik1113@gmail.com; leejjlaw@gmail.com; leesang@assembly.go.kr; leesj545@daum.net; limkhassembly@gmail.com; liy1964@empal.com; ljm631000@assembly.go.kr; ljm935@na.go.kr; lkh502503@gmail.com; lsywin445@gmail.com; m2hwaseo@gmail.com; mainsail440@daum.net; mapo_cho@naver.com; maumgil88@gmail.com; mgk2224@naver.com; mhb1961@naver.com; minjoo_ljk0410@naver.com; minjoomsk@naver.com; minkyucool@assembly.go.kr; moalarm2024@naver.com; moondaelim@naver.com; moongj67@gmail.com; mp_sj322@naver.com; mrleegt@gmail.com; myounggu.power@gmail.com; nakw63@naver.com; namgeunkim10@gmail.com; newkms2030@gmail.com; newwonju643@naver.com; nisoon@na.go.kr; ontoincha22@gmail.com; oshee0530@gmail.com; parkcd0214@gmail.com; parkhs2024@gmail.com; parkkyoontaek@naver.com; parksm2028@gmail.com; parksw2789@naver.com; peacesong1@naver.com; pjkorea21c@naver.com; plz.hongbae@gmail.com; psyfor2020@naver.com; ptgotogether@naver.com; pyk393329@gmail.com; qkrsw20@naver.com; reform1-1@hanmail.net; saeng0425@rebuildingk.kr; sahalsk1015@naver.com; saminhcm@gmail.com; saseyoung@naver.com; sbsulju@daum.net; shinjh744@naver.com; shinjs6411@gmail.com; shkay73@naver.com; shyoon@na.go.kr; sij5140@naver.com; sijkorea@gmail.com; sjbong4381@naver.com; smjingogo@gmail.com; songok4740@naver.com; sonms@assembly.go.kr; sotong848@daum.net; ssaribi0415@naver.com; strongwind01@naver.com; successhuh@gmail.com; sungkook337@naver.com; swkimsuwon@gmail.com; sylee0546@gmail.com; team1000haram@gmail.com; teampark2024@gmail.com; the.kim.weapon@gmail.com; the.kimyoon@gmail.com; tjcjsgh2024@naver.com; together.eut@gmail.com; ubuntu_21@naver.com; victory_cho@naver.com; victoryljb@naver.com; we1taeg@daum.net; winner4011@naver.com; wishjeju@hanmail.net; withmin413@gmail.com; wjseo21@rebuildingk.kr; worker21c@gmail.com; yangmunsuk7227@gmail.com; yb7841521@gmail.com; ybn733@naver.com; yc20002@naver.com; yeajijoy@gmail.com; yeskt@hanmail.net; yhassembly2024@naver.com; yjongo428@gmail.com; ymk0814@naver.com; youngcamp1@gmail.com; younky926@gmail.com; yslee9282@naver.com; yujung7522@gmail.com; yuseong0413@daum.net; kimgipyo24@naver.com; jeehye.park@assembly.go.kr; yeonh2ee@gmail.com; lywchosim@naver.com; assembly_ok@naver.com; ash_0515@naver.com; haimin@rebuildingk.kr; wisangk@naver.com; yesbupyeong@gmail.com; new_ansan@naver.com; kilee905@naver.com; sotong0743@gmail.com; jhkjinbo@gmail.com; sbumshin@naver.com; songpapjh22@naver.com; hangh21@naver.com

Subject: Urgent International Appeal: End Tethering and Prevent Wildfire Tragedies in Seoul, South Korea

Date: Sunday, July 27, 2025 12:16:50 AM

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

Dear Mayor Daniel Lurie and Esteemed Representatives of San Francisco,

I write to you with a heavy heart and an urgent plea for compassion. In Seoul, South Korea—your Sister City—dogs continue to suffer and die in ways that shock the conscience.

Despite South Korea's recent Manual for the Rescue and Protection of Companion Animals During Natural Disasters (May 2025), there are still no laws that truly protect these innocent lives. The manual is purely advisory, with no legal force to ensure animals are rescued in emergencies. Even worse, the barbaric practice of lifelong tethering remains completely legal, condemning countless dogs to a life of loneliness, filth, and chains barely long enough to turn around.

Time and again, wildfires sweep through these regions, leaving terrified, tethered dogs to face the flames alone. They are burned alive, forgotten, voiceless, and treated as disposable property. This is a moral catastrophe that demands action.

As leaders of Seoul's Sister City, you have a unique power—and responsibility—to speak out. I implore you to:

1. Publicly denounce the cruelty of lifelong tethering and the abandonment of animals during disasters. Silence allows this suffering to continue.

2. Reach out directly to your counterparts in Seoul. Share your deep concern and urge them to

enact binding laws that end tethering and guarantee companion animals are evacuated alongside their families.

3. Support critical national reforms in South Korea, including:

A complete, enforceable ban on lifelong tethering.
Mandatory evacuation protocols for companion animals.
Real penalties for abandonment and neglect, especially during emergencies.
Public campaigns that teach empathy and responsible care.
4. Offer San Francisco's partnership and resources, whether through expertise in humane disaster planning or joint initiatives that show what true sisterhood between cities can mean.

Please, take a moment to see the faces behind this tragedy (warning: deeply disturbing content):

https://www.youtube.com/shorts/m0FWFjIfbC8
https://www.youtube.com/shorts/7vZE_P_wGho
https://koreandogs.org/700-dogs-burned-alive/
https://koreandogs.org/bbibbi/
https://koreandogs.org/charles/
https://koreandogs.org/daepoong/
https://www.youtube.com/shorts/sbUi7K9mPTU
https://www.youtube.com/shorts/sStj0hH6MyM
https://www.youtube.com/shorts/A8OskdtJvjg
https://www.youtube.com/shorts/BfEbt6s79sE
https://youtu.be/MunZMwl6BmQ
https://www.youtube.com/shorts/hRocjMfllqM
https://www.youtube.com/shorts/hotkDKh8Ii8
https://www.youtube.com/shorts/SJ-bYNdeS6I
https://www.youtube.com/shorts/CeTa4VRG6pk
https://www.youtube.com/shorts/9Bway6u5sb4
https://www.youtube.com/shorts/cDWUTYsVQHQ
https://www.youtube.com/shorts/_LjaYeZkrQU
https://koreandogs.org/two-brothers-rescued/
https://koreandogs.org/uljin-fire/
https://koreandogs.org/gangwondo-fire/
https://koreandogs.org/danbi/
https://koreandogs.org/chungju-fire/
https://www.youtube.com/@TheFromcare/streams
Change is possible. South Korea has opened the door—but only strong, enforceable laws will put an end to this horror. As Seoul's Sister City, San Francisco's voice carries immense weight. Please use it to stand up for those who cannot beg for help themselves.

A global petition is growing: https://chng.it/dxkJTfLcLw. Let this be the moment when international friendship saves lives—not just human lives, but countless loyal, loving animals who depend entirely on our mercy.

With deep respect, urgency, and hope for your leadership,

Andrea Sreiber

From: Rebecca Mughal
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); kanglaw83@hanmail.net; sjkang2005@smc.seoul.kr; k-gimoon@hanmail.net; hiseocho@naver.com; aromaeffort@hanmail.net; smil-ing@naver.com; muse201@hotmail.com; kkhbb0331@daum.net; leejs8341@naver.com; kkd3344@hanmail.net; spoman88@naver.com; dwk5gangnam@gmail.com; visionbosco@naver.com; oki1422@naver.com; kimyc5975@naver.com; yongk0525@hanmail.net; pukasun011@hanmail.net; kwj22222@naver.com; kim22wt@naver.com; ij7857@gmail.com; k80209454@hanmail.net; 220601winner@naver.com; sujihoo@hanmail.net; gare1@hanmail.net; kts8104@hanmail.net; hyeon4123@hanmail.net; kign0071@naver.com; khyseoul7@daum.net; bombam111@naver.com; jnd0522@hanmail.net; chjin4455@nate.com; mydoh@naver.co m; nayuri89@naver.com; Mbj1440@naver.com; ksp9725@naver.com; shp2022@naver.com; parksuk7@hanmail.net; syannie@naver.com; 101gangbuk@gmail.com; sjpark5272@hanmail.net; myjjang55@hanmail.net; maum7412@naver.com; pjhkorworld@hanmail.net; csp2000@naver.com; seven7star77@hanmail.net; gox9778@nate.com; yeol1977@naver.com; ricehope@hanmail.net; sho3120@hanmail.net; zxy100@naver.com; mountain8511@naver.com; skt007@naver.com; songdoho88@naver.com; ecopolis2050@hanmail.net; flutelove2001@hanmail.net; bj618@hanmail.net; meiqing7@nate.com; kantry1@smc.seoul.kr; bmwohkr@naver.com; oje1015@hanmail.net; joinus7942@daum.net; kfmpd@naver.com; yumanhee@hanmail.net; yjhm8144@naver.com; dorimchun@hanmail.net; ds1msm@hanmail.net; etty02@smc.seoul.kr; yoonjb48@naver.com; lks7459@naver.com; min12343@naver.com; 2min5gi@naver.com; lover9474@naver.com; kee61k@empas.com; bjkmc@naver.com; seoul7635@gmail.com; teamleesanghoon@naver.com; zzz1895@naver.com; 113lee@naver.com; sora94seoul@gmail.com; sjl0894@hanmail.net; sm6244@naver.com; marinespyi@naver.com; dndsil@hanmail.net; st2020@hanmail.net; yiwh2898@naver.com; eunlim@ewhain.net; jongbae1252@daum.net; smilemen@hanmail.net; ljh5612@hanmail.net; seoul.lhw@gmail.com; archicbnu@naver.com; kcnljw@hanmail.net; sangchoo1900@hanmail.net; eparty@paran.com; cnseo566@naver.com; samueladams@naver.com; bjjeon918@hanmail.net; lehgoa@gmail.com; jw9976@naver.com
Subject: Urgent International Appeal: End Tethering and Prevent Wildfire Tragedies in Seoul, South Korea
Date: Wednesday, July 30, 2025 2:24:11 PM

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

Dear Mayor Daniel Lurie and Esteemed Representatives of San Francisco,

I write to you with a heavy heart and an urgent plea for compassion. In Seoul, South Korea—your Sister City—dogs continue to suffer and die in ways that shock the conscience.

Despite South Korea's recent Manual for the Rescue and Protection of Companion Animals During Natural Disasters (May 2025), there are still no laws that truly protect these innocent lives. The manual is purely advisory, with no legal force to ensure animals are rescued in emergencies. Even worse, the barbaric practice of lifelong tethering remains completely legal, condemning countless dogs to a life of loneliness, filth, and chains barely long enough to turn around.

Time and again, wildfires sweep through these regions, leaving terrified, tethered dogs to face the flames alone. They are burned alive, forgotten, voiceless, and treated as disposable property. This is a moral catastrophe that demands action.

As leaders of Seoul's Sister City, you have a unique power—and responsibility—to speak out. I implore you to:

1. Publicly denounce the cruelty of lifelong tethering and the abandonment of animals during disasters. Silence allows this suffering to continue.

2. Reach out directly to your counterparts in Seoul. Share your deep concern and urge them to enact binding laws that end tethering and guarantee companion animals are evacuated alongside their families.

3. Support critical national reforms in South Korea, including:

- A complete, enforceable ban on lifelong tethering.
- Mandatory evacuation protocols for companion animals.
- Real penalties for abandonment and neglect, especially during emergencies.
- Public campaigns that teach empathy and responsible care.

4. Offer San Francisco's partnership and resources, whether through expertise in humane disaster planning or joint initiatives that show what true sisterhood between cities can mean.

Please, take a moment to see the faces behind this tragedy (warning: deeply disturbing content):

- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/m0FWFjIfbC8
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/7vZE_P_wGho
- https://koreandogs.org/700-dogs-burned-alive/
- https://koreandogs.org/bbibbi/
- https://koreandogs.org/charles/

- https://koreandogs.org/daepoong/
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/sbUi7K9mPTU
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/sStj0hH6MyM
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/A8OskdtJvjg
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/BfEbt6s79sE
- https://youtu.be/MunZMwl6BmQ
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/hRocjMfllqM
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/hotkDKh8Ii8
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/SJ-bYNdeS6I
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/CeTa4VRG6pk
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/9Bway6u5sb4
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/cDWUTYsVQHQ
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/_LjaYeZkrQU
- https://koreandogs.org/two-brothers-rescued/
- https://koreandogs.org/uljin-fire/
- https://koreandogs.org/gangwondo-fire/
- https://koreandogs.org/danbi/
- https://koreandogs.org/chungju-fire/
- https://www.youtube.com/@TheFromcare/streams

Change is possible. South Korea has opened the door—but only strong, enforceable laws will put an end to this horror. As Seoul's Sister City, San Francisco's voice carries immense weight. Please use it to stand up for those who cannot beg for help themselves.

A global petition is growing: https://chng.it/dxkJTfLcLw. Let this be the moment when international friendship saves lives—not just human lives, but countless loyal, loving animals who depend entirely on our mercy.

The greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated.

With deep respect, urgency, and hope for your leadership,

Rebecca Dunne

United Kingdom

From: raymond georges

To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); kanglaw83@hanmail.net; sjkang2005@smc.seoul.kr; k-gimoon@hanmail.net; hiseocho@naver.com; aromaeffort@hanmail.net; smil-ing@naver.com; muse201@hotmail.com; kkhbb0331@daum.net; leejs8341@naver.com; kkd3344@hanmail.net; spoman88@naver.com; dwk5gangnam@gmail.com; visionbosco@naver.com; oki1422@naver.com; kimyc5975@naver.com; yongk0525@hanmail.net; pukasun011@hanmail.net; kwj22222@naver.com; kim22wt@naver.com; ij7857@gmail.com; k80209454@hanmail.net; 220601winner@naver.com; sujihoo@hanmail.net; gare1@hanmail.net; kts8104@hanmail.net; hyeon4123@hanmail.net; kign0071@naver.com; khyseoul7@daum.net; bombam111@naver.com; jnd0522@hanmail.net; chjin4455@nate.com; mydoh@naver.com; nayuri89@naver.com; Mbj1440@naver.com; ksp9725@naver.com; shp2022@naver.com; parksuk7@hanmail.net; syannie@naver.com; 101gangbuk@gmail.com; sjpark5272@hanmail.net; myjjang55@hanmail.net; maum7412@naver.com; pjhkorworld@hanmail.net; csp2000@naver.com; seven7star77@hanmail.net; gox9778@nate.com; yeol1977@naver.com; ricehope@hanmail.net; sho3120@hanmail.net; zxy100@naver.com; mountain8511@naver.com; skt007@naver.com; songdoho88@naver.com; ecopolis2050@hanmail.net; flutelove2001@hanmail.net; bj618@hanmail.net; meiqing7@nate.com; kantry1@smc.seoul.kr; bmwohkr@naver.com; oje1015@hanmail.net; joinus7942@daum.net; kfmpd@naver.com; yumanhee@hanmail.net; yjhm8144@naver.com; dorimchun@hanmail.net; ds1msm@hanmail.net; etty02@smc.seoul.kr; yoonjb48@naver.com; lks7459@naver.com; min12343@naver.com; 2min5gi@naver.com; lover9474@naver.com; kee61k@empas.com; bjkmc@naver.com; seoul7635@gmail.com; teamleesanghoon@naver.com; zzz1895@naver.com; 113lee@naver.com; sora94seoul@gmail.com; sjl0894@hanmail.net; sm6244@naver.com; marinespyi@naver.com; dndsil@hanmail.net; st2020@hanmail.net; yiwh2898@naver.com; eunlim@ewhain.net; jongbae1252@daum.net; smilemen@hanmail.net; ljh5612@hanmail.net; seoul.lhw@gmail.com; archicbnu@naver.com; kcnljw@hanmail.net; sangchoo1900@hanmail.net; eparty@paran.com; cnseo566@naver.com; samueladams@naver.com; bjjeon918@hanmail.net; 준. 정; jw9976@naver.com; chaemokdong@gmail.com; gichan6907@hanmail.net; minkyu0307@naver.com; choi_767@naver.com; inpraxis@naver.com; cjinh2261@naver.com; fng9129@hanmail.net; han-shin@naver.com; yangcheongo@naver.com; cp1055@naver.com; lovejane26@hanmail.net; hck01@hanmail.net; ENGLISH@assembly.go.kr; webmaster@assembly.go.kr; 015miae@naver.com; 0415gunsan@gmail.com; syd@assembly.go.kr; 1bddoit@gmail.com; 22.ksunmin@gmail.com; 326miae@gmail.com; 734ssj@gmail.com; 7842055@naver.com; assemblymoonsu@gmail.com; ayjk1101@gmail.com; bemil434@naver.com; changit@naver.com; choo_worl d@naver.com; chung10park@naver.com; dcparkjj@assembly.go.kr; dh337dh@naver.com; dj_koh7163@naver.com; eonju5257@gmail.com; gimpolovekjy@gmail.com; greenwind21@gmail.com; hangkim74@assembly.go.kr; happyhappo@naver.com; ilovebusanjin@hanmail.net; j7840790@gmail.com; jee21dongnae@naver.com; jeoung@gmail.com; jhkang315@gmail.com; jhkim1789@naver.com; jinjongoh.official@gmail.com; jjhgj0503@naver.com; jmoon123@naver.com; jongno.kwak@gmail.com; joo_jinwoo@naver.com; joonforpeace@gmail.com; jsh35351@naver.com; jsjeong0403@naver.com; jskshare2020@gmail.com; jungsdream24@gmail.com; jwk@rebuildingk.kr; jykimm61@assembly.go.kr; kimjungho3359@daum.net; kktlaw@naver.com; kts230410@gmail.com; letskt2020@gmail.com; limhoseon2020@naver.com; llj11@daum.net; lok0415@hanmail.net; napark81@naver.com; official_yt@naver.com; okhyung628@naver.com; parkdukhyum@naver.com; pbk705@naver.com; pksjoffice@naver.com; sbyoo64@naver.com; smpark3340@naver.com; unhah0301@gmail.com; vsbok@naver.com; woooo617@naver.com; ydkim22@naver.com; yjb870053@naver.com; yoons609@hanmail.net; youngjink840@naver.com; youngkyos@naver.com; yskys2020@naver.com; zeeahan635@gmail.com; 2024iccho@gmail.com; 2024wisunglac@gmail.com; 2040jd@gmail.com; 22yyh620@naver.com; 2yangs6288@naver.com; 335kang@naver.com; 3s0011@naver.com; 518jjs@naver.com; 532jhlee@gmail.com; 613jjs@gmail.com; 623kimjk@gmail.com; 7842760@naver.com; 7844165@naver.com; 7844861@naver.com; 7880291@naver.com; 7882576kj@hanmail.net; 7882579@naver.com; 907kth@naver.com; ahndogeol@naver.com; ahnho065@gmail.com; anotherk7@gmail.com; antagt@naver.com; anyangmin@gmail.com; assembly0915@naver.com; assembly847@naver.com; bakeunjeong22@gmail.com; best1yty@gmail.com; bhrassembly0217@gmail.com; bigmann64@naver.com; bjh438@naver.com; booseungchan.yongin@gmail.com; braveplane@gmail.com; bsa_teacher@naver.com; can929292@naver.com; cdypeace@hanmail.net; cesof@naver.com; chajiho5301@gmail.com; chhi.address@gma il.com; choimh867@gmail.com; choiwakeup@gmail.com; chokuk@assembly.go.kr; chungco518@gmail.com; csa2418@naver.com; csahn435@gmail.com; csh240410@naver.com; dalhee621@naver.com; dobongstar24@naver.com; dongah1021@gmail.com; dongbu1538@naver.com; dskimbless@naver.com; dw7227@naver.com; flyhong21@naver.com; fopeopler76@gmail.com; gangseo.kap@gmail.com; gikuchon@nate.com; gimpo_park@naver.com; gkim338@naver.com; goanghee1@naver.com; gohoonsik@gmail.com; gracecho1@naver.com; gracesook52@rebuildingk.kr; guseng@hanmail.net; gyewoncho@naver.com; heeyong4you@naver.com; hello@yonghyein.kr; hjyun9292@naver.com; hmsgb2024@gmail.com; hoongi2024@gmail.com; hotjjoon@gmail.com; newds61@naver.com; huhsmsm@naver.com; hwang_0410@naver.com; hwanghee6728@gmail.com; hwangms0@naver.com; indobangrang@hanmail.net; inseon0502@naver.com; intoan429@gmail.com; ironkwon24@gmail.com; ironregion24@gmail.com; jaeganglee@gmail.com; jassembly536@gmail.com; jcm5440@gmail.com; jeonjd7877@gmail.com; jinhae.jump@gmail.co m; jiyeonwecan@naver.com; jongsyy@naver.com; joomincenter@gmail.com; jth5073@gmail.com; juno.news2020@gmail.com; jwp615@naver.com; jyb116@naver.com; jylee_nrp@naver.com; kds21341@naver.com; khchoo@assembly.go.kr; khjkorea@assembly.go.kr; khyungdong@naver.com; kimbyungjoo62@gmail.com; kimeunhye_official@naver.com; kimeunpyung0@gmail.com; kimhyun0610@gmail.com; kiminnotank@naver.com; kimkh4u@naver.com; kimnowongu@gmail.com; kimsangwook80@naver.com; kimsg5358@naver.com; kimsw910@naver.com; kimwoni923@gmail.com; kim-youngho@naver.com; kiyku@naver.com; knh@na.go.kr; kominjung21@gmail.com; ksdd22@naver.com; kshdg11@gmail.com; kshoi72@naver.com; kskangsk@na.go.kr; ktn0320@daum.net; kyjtongil@naver.com;

law@bychoi.com; lawjj@naver.com; ldek3525@naver.com; leehaesik1113@gmail.com; leejjlaw@gmail.com; leesang@assembly.go.kr; leesj545@daum.net; limkhassembly@gmail.com; liy1964@empal.com; ljm631000@assembly.go.kr; ljm935@na.go.kr; lkh502503@gmail.com; lsywin445@gmail.com; m2hwaseo@gmail.com; mains ail440@daum.net; mapo_cho@naver.com; maumgil88@gmail.com; mgk2224@naver.com; mhb1961@naver.com; minjoo_ljk0410@naver.com; minjoomsk@naver.com; minkyucool@assembly.go.kr; moalarm2024@naver.com; moondaelim@naver.com; moongj67@gmail.com; mp_sj322@naver.com; mrleegt@gmail.com; myounggu.power@gmail.com; nakw63@naver.com; namgeunkim10@gmail.com; newkms2030@gmail.com; newwonju643@naver.com; nisoon@na.go.kr; ontoincha22@gmail.com; oshee0530@gmail.com; parkcd0214@gmail.com; parkhs2024@gmail.com; parkkyoontaek@naver.com; parksm2028@gmail.com; parksw2789@naver.com; peacesong1@naver.com; pjkorea21c@naver.com; plz.hongbae@gmail.com; psyfor2020@naver.com; ptgotogether@naver.com; pyk393329@gmail.com; qkrsw20@naver.com; reform1-1@hanmail.net; saeng0425@rebuildingk.kr; sahalsk1015@naver.com; saminhcm@gmail.com; saseyoung@naver.com; sbsulju@daum.net; shinjh744@naver.com; shinjs6411@gmail.com; shkay73@naver.com; shyoon@na.go.kr; sij5140@naver.com; sijkorea@gmail.com; sjbong4381@naver.com; smjingogo@gmail.com; songok4740@naver.com; sonms@assembly.go.kr; sotong848@daum.net; ssaribi0415@naver.com; strongwind01@naver.com; successhuh@gmail.com; sungkook337@naver.com; swkimsuwon@gmail.com; sylee0546@gmail.com; team1000haram@gmail.com; teampark2024@gmail.com; the.kim.weapon@gmail.com; the.kimyoon@gmail.com; tjcjsgh2024@naver.com; together.eut@gmail.com; ubuntu_21@naver.com; victory_cho@naver.com; victoryljb@naver.com; we1taeg@daum.net; winner4011@naver.com; wishjeju@hanmail.net; withmin413@gmail.com; wjseo21@rebuildingk.kr; worker21c@gmail.com; yangmunsuk7227@gmail.com; yb7841521@gmail.com; ybn733@naver.com; yc20002@naver.com; yeajijoy@gmail.com; yeskt@hanmail.net; yhassembly2024@naver.com; yjongo428@gmail.com; ymk0814@naver.com; youngcamp1@gmail.com; younky926@gmail.com; yslee9282@naver.com; yujung7522@gmail.com; yuseong0413@daum.net; kimgipyo24@naver.com; jeehye.park@assembly.go.kr; yeonh2ee@gmail.com; lywchosim@naver.com; assembly_ok@naver.com; ash_0515@naver.com; haimin@rebuildingk.kr; wisangk@naver.com; yesbupyeong@gmail.com; new_ansan@naver.com; kilee905@naver.com; sotong0743@gmail.com; jhkjinbo@gmail.com; sbumshin@naver.com; songpapjh22@naver.com

Subject: Please,end Tethering and Prevent Wildfire Tragedies in Seoul, South Korea

Date: Monday, August 18, 2025 9:16:59 AM

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

Dear Mayor Daniel Lurie and Esteemed Representatives of San Francisco,

I write to you with a heavy heart and an urgent plea for compassion. In Seoul, South Korea—your Sister City—dogs continue to suffer and die in ways that shock the conscience.

Despite South Korea's recent Manual for the Rescue and Protection of Companion Animals During Natural Disasters (May 2025), there are still no laws that truly protect these innocent lives. The manual is purely advisory, with no legal force to ensure animals are rescued in emergencies. Even worse, the barbaric practice of lifelong tethering remains completely legal, condemning countless dogs to a life of loneliness, filth, and chains barely long enough to turn around.

Time and again, wildfires sweep through these regions, leaving terrified, tethered dogs to face the flames alone. They are burned alive, forgotten, voiceless, and treated as disposable property. This is a moral catastrophe that demands action.

As leaders of Seoul's Sister City, you have a unique power—and responsibility—to speak out. I implore you to:

1. Publicly denounce the cruelty of lifelong tethering and the abandonment of animals during disasters. Silence allows this suffering to continue.

2. Reach out directly to your counterparts in Seoul. Share your deep concern and urge them to enact binding laws that end tethering and guarantee companion animals are evacuated alongside their families.

3. Support critical national reforms in South Korea, including:

- A complete, enforceable ban on lifelong tethering.
- Mandatory evacuation protocols for companion animals.
- Real penalties for abandonment and neglect, especially during emergencies.
- Public campaigns that teach empathy and responsible care.

4. Offer San Francisco's partnership and resources, whether through expertise in humane disaster planning or joint initiatives that show what true sisterhood between cities can mean.

Please, take a moment to see the faces behind this tragedy (warning: deeply disturbing content):

- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/m0FWFjIfbC8
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/7vZE_P_wGho
- https://koreandogs.org/700-dogs-burned-alive/
- https://koreandogs.org/bbibbi/
- https://koreandogs.org/charles/
- https://koreandogs.org/daepoong/
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/sbUi7K9mPTU
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/sStj0hH6MyM
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/A8OskdtJvjg
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/BfEbt6s79sE
- https://youtu.be/MunZMwl6BmQ
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/hRocjMfllqM
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/hotkDKh8Ii8
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/SJ-bYNdeS6I
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/CeTa4VRG6pk
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/9Bway6u5sb4
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/cDWUTYsVQHQ
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/_LjaYeZkrQU
- https://koreandogs.org/two-brothers-rescued/
- https://koreandogs.org/uljin-fire/
- https://koreandogs.org/gangwondo-fire/
- https://koreandogs.org/danbi/
- https://koreandogs.org/chungju-fire/
- https://www.youtube.com/@TheFromcare/streams

Change is possible. South Korea has opened the door—but only strong, enforceable laws will put an end to this horror. As Seoul's Sister City, San Francisco's voice carries immense weight. Please use it to stand up for those who cannot beg for help themselves.

A global petition is growing: https://chng.it/dxkJTfLcLw. Let this be the moment when international friendship saves lives—not just human lives, but countless loyal, loving animals who depend entirely on our mercy.

With deep respect, urgency, and hope for your leadership,

GEORGES raymond

FRANCE

From: raymond georges

To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); kanglaw83@hanmail.net; sjkang2005@smc.seoul.kr; k-gimoon@hanmail.net; hiseocho@naver.com; aromaeffort@hanmail.net; smil-ing@naver.com; muse201@hotmail.com; kkhbb0331@daum.net; leejs8341@naver.com; kkd3344@hanmail.net; spoman88@naver.com; dwk5gangnam@gmail.com; visionbosco@naver.com; oki1422@naver.com; kimyc5975@naver.com; yongk0525@hanmail.net; pukasun011@hanmail.net; kwj22222@naver.com; kim22wt@naver.com; ij7857@gmail.com; k80209454@hanmail.net; 220601winner@naver.com; sujihoo@hanmail.net; gare1@hanmail.net; kts8104@hanmail.net; hyeon4123@hanmail.net; kign0071@naver.com; khyseoul7@daum.net; bombam111@naver.com; jnd0522@hanmail.net; chjin4455@nate.com; mydoh@naver.com; nayuri89@naver.com; Mbj1440@naver.com; ksp9725@naver.com; shp2022@naver.com; parksuk7@hanmail.net; syannie@naver.com; 101gangbuk@gmail.com; sjpark5272@hanmail.net; myjjang55@hanmail.net; maum7412@naver.com; pjhkorworld@hanmail.net; csp2000@naver.com; seven7star77@hanmail.net; gox9778@nate.com; yeol1977@naver.com; ricehope@hanmail.net; sho3120@hanmail.net; zxy100@naver.com; mountain8511@naver.com; skt007@naver.com; songdoho88@naver.com; ecopolis2050@hanmail.net; flutelove2001@hanmail.net; bj618@hanmail.net; meiqing7@nate.com; kantry1@smc.seoul.kr; bmwohkr@naver.com; oje1015@hanmail.net; joinus7942@daum.net; kfmpd@naver.com; yumanhee@hanmail.net; yjhm8144@naver.com; dorimchun@hanmail.net; ds1msm@hanmail.net; etty02@smc.seoul.kr; yoonjb48@naver.com; lks7459@naver.com; min12343@naver.com; 2min5gi@naver.com; lover9474@naver.com; kee61k@empas.com; bjkmc@naver.com; seoul7635@gmail.com; teamleesanghoon@naver.com; zzz1895@naver.com; 113lee@naver.com; sora94seoul@gmail.com; sjl0894@hanmail.net; sm6244@naver.com; marinespyi@naver.com; dndsil@hanmail.net; st2020@hanmail.net; yiwh2898@naver.com; eunlim@ewhain.net; jongbae1252@daum.net; smilemen@hanmail.net; ljh5612@hanmail.net; seoul.lhw@gmail.com; archicbnu@naver.com; kcnljw@hanmail.net; sangchoo1900@hanmail.net; eparty@paran.com; cnseo566@naver.com; samueladams@naver.com; bjjeon918@hanmail.net; 준. 정; jw9976@naver.com; chaemokdong@gmail.com; gichan6907@hanmail.net; minkyu0307@naver.com; choi_767@naver.com; inpraxis@naver.com; cjinh2261@naver.com; fng9129@hanmail.net; han-shin@naver.com; yangcheongo@naver.com; cp1055@naver.com; lovejane26@hanmail.net; hck01@hanmail.net; ENGLISH@assembly.go.kr; webmaster@assembly.go.kr; 015miae@naver.com; 0415gunsan@gmail.com; syd@assembly.go.kr; 1bddoit@gmail.com; 22.ksunmin@gmail.com; 326miae@gmail.com; 734ssj@gmail.com; 7842055@naver.com; assemblymoonsu@gmail.com; ayjk1101@gmail.com; bemil434@naver.com; changit@naver.com; choo_worl d@naver.com; chung10park@naver.com; dcparkjj@assembly.go.kr; dh337dh@naver.com; dj_koh7163@naver.com; eonju5257@gmail.com; gimpolovekjy@gmail.com; greenwind21@gmail.com; hangkim74@assembly.go.kr; happyhappo@naver.com; ilovebusanjin@hanmail.net; j7840790@gmail.com; jee21dongnae@naver.com; jeoung@gmail.com; jhkang315@gmail.com; jhkim1789@naver.com; jinjongoh.official@gmail.com; jjhgj0503@naver.com; jmoon123@naver.com; jongno.kwak@gmail.com; joo_jinwoo@naver.com; joonforpeace@gmail.com; jsh35351@naver.com; jsjeong0403@naver.com; jskshare2020@gmail.com; jungsdream24@gmail.com; jwk@rebuildingk.kr; jykimm61@assembly.go.kr; kimjungho3359@daum.net; kktlaw@naver.com; kts230410@gmail.com; letskt2020@gmail.com; limhoseon2020@naver.com; llj11@daum.net; lok0415@hanmail.net; napark81@naver.com; official_yt@naver.com; okhyung628@naver.com; parkdukhyum@naver.com; pbk705@naver.com; pksjoffice@naver.com; sbyoo64@naver.com; smpark3340@naver.com; unhah0301@gmail.com; vsbok@naver.com; woooo617@naver.com; ydkim22@naver.com; yjb870053@naver.com; yoons609@hanmail.net; youngjink840@naver.com; youngkyos@naver.com; yskys2020@naver.com; zeeahan635@gmail.com; 2024iccho@gmail.com; 2024wisunglac@gmail.com; 2040jd@gmail.com; 22yyh620@naver.com; 2yangs6288@naver.com; 335kang@naver.com; 3s0011@naver.com; 518jjs@naver.com; 532jhlee@gmail.com; 613jjs@gmail.com; 623kimjk@gmail.com; 7842760@naver.com; 7844165@naver.com; 7844861@naver.com; 7880291@naver.com; 7882576kj@hanmail.net; 7882579@naver.com; 907kth@naver.com; ahndogeol@naver.com; ahnho065@gmail.com; anotherk7@gmail.com; antagt@naver.com; anyangmin@gmail.com; assembly0915@naver.com; assembly847@naver.com; bakeunjeong22@gmail.com; best1yty@gmail.com; bhrassembly0217@gmail.com; bigmann64@naver.com; bjh438@naver.com; booseungchan.yongin@gmail.com; braveplane@gmail.com; bsa_teacher@naver.com; can929292@naver.com

Subject: Please, end Tethering and Prevent Wildfire Tragedies in Seoul, South Korea

Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 9:15:58 AM

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

Dear Mayor Daniel Lurie and Esteemed Representatives of San Francisco,

I write to you with a heavy heart and an urgent plea for compassion. In Seoul, South Korea—your Sister City—dogs continue to suffer and die in ways that shock the

conscience.

Despite South Korea's recent Manual for the Rescue and Protection of Companion Animals During Natural Disasters (May 2025), there are still no laws that truly protect these innocent lives. The manual is purely advisory, with no legal force to ensure animals are rescued in emergencies. Even worse, the barbaric practice of lifelong tethering remains completely legal, condemning countless dogs to a life of loneliness, filth, and chains barely long enough to turn around.

Time and again, wildfires sweep through these regions, leaving terrified, tethered dogs to face the flames alone. They are burned alive, forgotten, voiceless, and treated as disposable property. This is a moral catastrophe that demands action.

As leaders of Seoul's Sister City, you have a unique power—and responsibility—to speak out. I implore you to:

1. Publicly denounce the cruelty of lifelong tethering and the abandonment of animals during disasters. Silence allows this suffering to continue.

2. Reach out directly to your counterparts in Seoul. Share your deep concern and urge them to enact binding laws that end tethering and guarantee companion animals are evacuated alongside their families.

3. Support critical national reforms in South Korea, including:

- A complete, enforceable ban on lifelong tethering.
- Mandatory evacuation protocols for companion animals.
- Real penalties for abandonment and neglect, especially during emergencies.
- Public campaigns that teach empathy and responsible care.

4. Offer San Francisco's partnership and resources, whether through expertise in humane disaster planning or joint initiatives that show what true sisterhood between cities can mean.

Please, take a moment to see the faces behind this tragedy (warning: deeply disturbing content):

- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/m0FWFjIfbC8
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/7vZE_P_wGho
- https://koreandogs.org/700-dogs-burned-alive/
- https://koreandogs.org/bbibbi/
- https://koreandogs.org/charles/
- https://koreandogs.org/daepoong/
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/sbUi7K9mPTU
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/sStj0hH6MyM
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/A8OskdtJvjg
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/BfEbt6s79sE
- https://youtu.be/MunZMwl6BmQ
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/hRocjMfllqM
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/hotkDKh8Ii8
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/SJ-bYNdeS6I
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/CeTa4VRG6pk
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/9Bway6u5sb4

- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/cDWUTYsVQHQ
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/_LjaYeZkrQU
- https://koreandogs.org/two-brothers-rescued/
- https://koreandogs.org/uljin-fire/
- https://koreandogs.org/gangwondo-fire/
- https://koreandogs.org/danbi/
- https://koreandogs.org/chungju-fire/
- https://www.youtube.com/@TheFromcare/streams

Change is possible. South Korea has opened the door—but only strong, enforceable laws will put an end to this horror. As Seoul's Sister City, San Francisco's voice carries immense weight. Please use it to stand up for those who cannot beg for help themselves.

A global petition is growing: https://chng.it/dxkJTfLcLw. Let this be the moment when international friendship saves lives—not just human lives, but countless loyal, loving animals who depend entirely on our mercy.

With deep respect, urgency, and hope for your leadership,

GEORGES raymond

FRANCE

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)
Subject:	Animal welfare in South Korea - 2 letters
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:21:59 PM
Attachments:	PC 1 - PC animals in South Korea (2 letters).pdf

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached two letters from members of the public regarding animal welfare in South Korea.

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.*

Urgent International Appeal: End Tethering and Prevent Wildfire Tragedies in Seoul, South Korea

Dear Mayor Daniel Lurie and Esteemed Representatives of San Francisco,

I write to you with a heavy heart and an urgent plea for compassion. In Seoul, South Korea — your Sister City — dogs continue to suffer and die in ways that shock the conscience.

Despite South Korea's recent Manual for the Rescue and Protection of Companion Animals During Natural Disasters (May 2025), there are still no laws that truly protect these innocent lives. The manual is purely advisory, with no legal force to ensure animals are rescued in emergencies. Even worse, the barbaric practice of lifelong tethering remains completely legal, condemning countless dogs to a life of loneliness, filth, and chains barely long enough to turn around.

Time and again, wildfires sweep through these regions, leaving terrified, tethered dogs to face the flames alone. They are burned alive, forgotten, voiceless, and treated as disposable property. This is a moral catastrophe that demands action.

As leaders of Seoul's Sister City, you have a unique power — and responsibility — to speak out. I implore you to:

1. Publicly denounce the cruelty of lifelong tethering and the abandonment of animals during disasters. Silence allows this suffering to continue.

2. Reach out directly to your counterparts in Seoul. Share your deep concern and urge them to enact binding laws that end tethering and guarantee companion animals are evacuated alongside their families.

3. Support critical national reforms in South Korea, including:

- A complete, enforceable ban on lifelong tethering.
- Mandatory evacuation protocols for companion animals.
- Real penalties for abandonment and neglect, especially during emergencies.
- Public campaigns that teach empathy and responsible care.

4. Offer San Francisco's partnership and resources, whether through expertise in humane disaster planning or joint initiatives that show what true sisterhood between cities can mean.

Please, take a moment to see the faces behind this tragedy (warning: deeply disturbing content):

- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/m0FWFj1fbC8
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/7vZE_P_wGho
- https://koreandogs.org/700-dogs-burned-alive/
- https://koreandogs.org/bbibbi/
- https://koreandogs.org/charles/
- https://koreandogs.org/daepoong/
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/sbUi7K9mPTU

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 JUL 25 AM 09:33
09 BOS-11

- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/sStj0hH6MyM
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/A8OskdtJvjg
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/BfEbt6s79sE
- https://youtu.be/MunZMwl6BmQ
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/hRocjMfllqM
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/hotkDKh8Ii8
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/SJ-bYNdeS6I
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/CeTa4VRG6pk
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/9Bway6u5sb4
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/cDWUTYsVQHQ
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/_LjaYeZkrQU
- https://koreandogs.org/two-brothers-rescued/
- https://koreandogs.org/uljin-fire/
- https://koreandogs.org/gangwondo-fire/
- https://koreandogs.org/danbi/
- https://koreandogs.org/chungju-fire/
- https://www.youtube.com/@TheFromeare/streams

Change is possible. South Korea has opened the door – but only strong, enforceable laws will put an end to this horror. As Seoul's Sister City, San Francisco's voice carries immense weight. Please use it to stand up for those who cannot beg for help themselves.

A global petition is growing: https://chng.it/dxkJTfLcLw. Let this be the moment when international friendship saves lives – not just human lives, but countless loyal, loving animals who depend entirely on our mercy.

With deep respect, urgency, and hope for your leadership.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jodi Rodar
223 North Valley Road
Pelham, MA 01002
USA

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors, 25 July, 2025

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 JUL 29 AM11:05
BOS-11

First of all, I send you greetings from Dallas, Texas, USA.

This is a request regarding your sister Seoul, South Korea.

I've traveled to South Korea multiple times. The last visit was late October/early November. Please see the attachment which contains my airline boarding passes as proof.

I really really enjoy the people, culture and food. Unfortunately, I personally witnessed that South Korea is not very nice when it comes to animal welfare.

I write to you with a heavy heart and an urgent plea for compassion. In Seoul, South Korea—your Sister City—dogs continue to suffer and die in ways that shock the conscience.

Despite South Korea's recent **Manual for the Rescue and Protection of Companion Animals During Natural Disasters (May 2025)**, there are still no laws that truly protect these innocent lives. The manual is purely advisory, with no legal force to ensure animals are rescued in emergencies. Even worse, the barbaric practice of lifelong tethering remains completely legal, condemning countless dogs to a life of loneliness, filth, and chains barely long enough to turn around.

Time and again, wildfires sweep through these regions, leaving terrified, tethered dogs to face the flames alone. They are burned alive, forgotten, voiceless, and treated as disposable property. This is a moral catastrophe that demands action.

As leaders of Seoul's Sister City, you have a unique power—and responsibility—to speak out. I implore you to:

1. Publicly denounce the cruelty of lifelong tethering and the abandonment of animals during disasters. Silence allows this suffering to continue.

2. Reach out directly to your counterparts in Seoul. Share your deep concern and urge them to enact binding laws that end tethering and guarantee companion animals are evacuated alongside their families.

3. Support critical national reforms in South Korea, including:

- A complete, enforceable ban on lifelong tethering.
- Mandatory evacuation protocols for companion animals.
- Real penalties for abandonment and neglect, especially during emergencies.
- Public campaigns that teach empathy and responsible care.

4. Offer San Francisco's partnership and resources, whether through expertise in humane disaster planning or joint initiatives that show what true sisterhood between cities can mean.

Please, take a moment to see the faces behind this tragedy (warning: deeply disturbing content):

- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/m0FWFjIfbC8
- https://www.youtube.com/shorts/7vZE_P_wGho
- https://koreandogs.org/700-dogs-burned-alive/

•https://koreandogs.org/bbibbi/

Change is possible. South Korea has opened the door—but only strong, enforceable laws will put an end to this horror. As Seoul's Sister City, San Francisco's voice carries immense weight. Please use it to stand up for those who cannot beg for help themselves.

A global petition is growing: **https://chng.it/dxkJTfLcLw.** Let this be the moment when international friendship saves lives—not just human lives, but countless loyal, loving animals who depend entirely on our mercy.

With deep respect, urgency, and hope for your leadership, I kindly await your reply.

Sincerely,

Rodolfo Gallardo
3971 Fernando Dr.
Euless, TX 76040 USA

eire96@yahoo.com mobile tel. 001.817.919.1236

SUDI SCULL MFT, C.N.

Psychotherapy

Nutritional Counseling

Item 34

August 4, 2025

Hello Board of Supervisors,

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 AUG 11 PM 4:16

3
BOS-11

Please oppose AT&T's bill 470 to retire the copper landline in San Francisco. Due to earthquakes & emergencies, the landline always comes through. Last year a large portion of the Western/mid-western states lost cell coverage. AT&T stated "use your landline or go to your neighbor who has a landline". Additionally a growing portion of the population have an electromagnetic disability commonly called EMF sensitivity. I am one of those. I cannot use computers or cellphones & without a copper landline, I would have no means of communication. Those under 60 yrs old have a 20% higher chance of developing cancer & likewise anxiety & depression have skyrocketed, according to the Wall Street Journal.

The California Public Utility Commission opposes retiring the landline phone. The previous Commission under President Peevey likewise supported the copper landline.

AT&T keeps coming forward with a new bill. They can't seem to accept the CPUC's decision that they are the carrier of last resort & must continue providing the copper landline phone.

Thank you for your close attention to this matter.

Sincerely, Sudi Scull MFT CN

78 Peralta Street San Francisco, CA 94110 MFT# 36910 415 282 8185

prague:project
498 Carl St. no.2 · San Francisco
Calif 94117 U.S.A. (415) 665-2992
mayacain@well.com

To:
city of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
California 94102-4689

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 AUG 14 AM 09:56

BOS-11

I am writing to you as a resident of San Francisco.

I have not been able to use a cell phone since 2010, when I was severely radiated by one smart meter for three months, that PG&E installed seven feet below the head of my bed. It was pure luck that I learned the smart meter was the cause of me having all Top Ten radiation health problems.

Since then, I have insomnia, plus headaches and tinnitus 24/7. It is worse when I must be in cars, elevators, buildings with high wireless emissions, in crowds of people all wearing cell phones, and when I am near 5G transmitters.

So, Please Understand that I cannot use a cell phone! and that my land line is my life line

PLEASE SAVE THE LANDLINE PHONES!

Sincerely,
Maya Cain
Landline phone - 415-665-2992

p.s. Please give this information to the California Public Utilities Commission

Item 35

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: Do You Believe it"s Right that San Francisco Government Has Chosen to Prioritize Trees over Pedestrian Safety and Disability Access to Sidewalks?
Date: Wednesday, July 30, 2025 11:56:44 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding sidewalk safety.

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.

-----Original Message-----
From: Howard Chabner <hlchabner@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, July 26, 2025 5:30 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Burke, Robyn (BOS) <robyn.burke@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; Del Rosario, Mick (BOS) <mick.delrosario@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; Nagano, Tomio (BOS) <tomio.nagano@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Logan, Samantha (BOS) <sam.logan@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.ferrigno@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; Prager, Jackie (BOS) <jackie.prager@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Li.Lovett@sfgov.org; Snyder, Jen (BOS) <jen.snyder@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Quan, Daisy (RET - Contractor) <daisy.quan@sfgov.org>; Fregosi, Ian (BOS) <ian.fregosi@sfgov.org>; Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Ginsburg, Phil (REC) <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>; Commission, Recpark (REC) <recpark.commission@sfgov.org>; Romaidis, John (REC) <john.romaidis@sfgov.org>; Jensen, Kevin (DPW) <Kevin.W.Jensen@sfdpw.org>; Kaplan, Debby (HSA) <deborah.kaplan@sfgov.org>; MDC (ADM) <MDC@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Pearman, Rick (DPW) <Rick.Pearman@sfdpw.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Gelardin, Eli (HSA) <eli.gelardin@sfgov.org>; Smolinski, Helen (HSA) <helen.smolinski@sfgov.org>
Cc: tkpendergast@live.com; jd.morris@sfchronicle.com; fenston@wamu.org; rswan@sfchronicle.com; nora.mishanec@sfchronicle.com; ricardo.cano@sfchronicle.com; michael.barba@sfchronicle.com; PHartlaub@sfchronicle.com; 'Howard Chabner ' <hlchabner@comcast.net>; 'Cabanatuan, Michael' <mcabanatuan@sfchronicle.com>; 'Douglas L Comstock' <dougcomz@mac.com>; Tim@48Hills.org; tips@sfstandard.com; han@sfstandard.com; ggreschler@sfstandard.com; knguyen@sfstandard.com
Subject: Do You Believe it's Right that San Francisco Government Has Chosen to Prioritize Trees over Pedestrian Safety and Disability Access to Sidewalks?

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

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors President Mandelman, Supervisors, and City employees:

I'm writing again about badly upended sidewalks that violate federal and California disability civil rights laws and are dangerous for all pedestrians.

Octavia near Hayes. I'm in the Hayes Valley neighborhood frequently for restaurants and concerts. In April 2025 I encountered a dangerously upended sidewalk on the east side of Octavia just north of Hayes; I was unable to proceed, so I turned around. On April 20, 2025 I sent you an email entitled "Example of dangerous, illegal sidewalk conditions – Octavia near Hayes; Also, absurd blue zone" and attached four photos. The photos are also attached to this email.

I said: "Does any elected official or City employee receiving this email believe that this sidewalk is safe? Legal? (I don't expect anyone to admit in writing that the conditions are illegal, but if you are in doubt, consult the Office of the City Attorney.) Does anyone believe that this reflects well on the City and County of San Francisco and its government?"

"I don't know the type of tree that is upending the sidewalk, but there are many trees of the same species throughout San Francisco, especially throughout Hayes Valley. Many are causing badly upended sidewalks. It's pretty clear that this species of tree should never have been planted. Besides replacing the sidewalk and curb ramps in this photo, and those referred to in my other emails, I request that the tree be removed and the appropriate City agencies and departments do an audit or inspection of sidewalk trees throughout San Francisco to make sure that the appropriate species of trees are being planted. And wherever conditions like these exist, or are likely to exist in time, the tree causing the upending should be removed."

To their credit, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood and his staff responded quickly and said they'd look into the situation. (No previous Supervisor in my district responded in any way to my complaints about disability access/disability rights, and probably not to anyone else's, either.) Mahmood staff interacted with DPW. DPW said there's a service order regarding this tree from July 2024, the tree is being monitored, and DPW applied asphalt to the sidewalk in order to smooth out the sharp edges. The bottom line is that DPW, through its Bureau of Urban Forestry, has refused to remove the tree and cannot even commit to what they might do to mitigate the dangerous sidewalk nor commit to a timeline. From Mahmood staff member Will's May 29, 2025 email to me:

"I've connected with my colleagues at Public Works again and want to be transparent: it is extremely unlikely that this tree will be removed. Public Works has reviewed the case and determined that the tree is healthy and structurally sound, meaning it does not meet the criteria for removal."

"While we understand and don't discount the impact it's had on your experience as a neighbor, the City's current approach emphasizes preservation of healthy trees. We've requested that Public Works consider any potential mitigations they can implement to reduce the effects on the surrounding sidewalk—for example, pruning or root maintenance—but cannot guarantee any specific timeline or outcome at this stage." (Emphasis added.)

Will stated in his May 30 email:

"You're right to expect accountability and transparency from our office and from the departments we work with. Here's what I can share in response to your questions, and what I'm actively working to gather:

* Written Criteria for Tree Removal:

Public Works generally evaluates trees for removal based on health, structure, species, and public safety impact.

* Decision Authority and Appeal Process:

The Bureau of Urban Forestry (BUF) under SF Public Works makes the call on removals, based on arborist assessments. While there's no formal public-facing appeals process for retained trees, there is a process for appealing approved removals via public hearing. Clearly, that leaves folks like you in a frustrating limbo when you disagree with a decision not to act."

You can see from the photos that, as DPW told Mahmood staff, DPW had already applied asphalt on some of the sharp edges of the upended sidewalk when I encountered it. But it's obvious that this tiny Band-Aid – like trying to extinguish a four alarm fire with a garden hose – doesn't come close to solving the problem. Grinding tree roots and adding more asphalt won't, either. Even if they did solve the problem for a moment – which they won't – the roots would grow back fairly quickly and the asphalt would wear away. If this tree doesn't warrant removal for safety and disability civil rights, does any tree?

Although I didn't mention it in my earlier email, it goes without saying that if the tree were removed, it should be replaced by a new, young tree of an appropriate species.

Other Dangerous Sidewalks in Hayes Valley and Lower Haight. Enclosed are 10 photos of dangerously upended sidewalks in or near Hayes Valley taken in June 2025. The locations are 105-115 Fillmore (one photo), west side of Franklin between Oak and Hickory (two photos), west side of Laguna between Hayes and Fell (three photos), 50 Scott across from Lloyd (two photos), and Waller at Scott (two photos). The south side of Hayes between Gough and Franklin, and other locations in Hayes Valley, also have dangerously upended sidewalks.

Dangerous Sidewalks in NOPA. Enclosed are nine photos of dangerously upended sidewalks in my neighborhood, NOPA, taken on June 15, 2025. The locations are the west side of Baker between Fell and Hayes (three photos), east side of Ashbury between Grove and Hayes (four photos), and south side of Grove between Masonic and Ashbury (two photos). The first location is near the front entrance to Mercy Terrace, a large senior housing complex. The second two border the John Adams Campus of City College of San Francisco. All three have heavy pedestrian traffic.

My email of October 7, 2021 entitled "Curb ramps needed on JFK Drive; driveway on Stanyan creates too steep a cross slope" states: "The intersection of the sidewalk on the west side of Stanyan between Hayes and Fell and the driveway to the Rec and Park parking lot near McLaren Lodge has a dangerously steep cross slope. Recently I was rolling in my electric wheelchair downhill on the sidewalk (southbound) and required help from a good Samaritan driver, who got out of his car and helped steady my wheelchair as I passed the intersection. The driveway needs to be made more gradual."

The Recreation and Parks Department inspected and acknowledged that the cross slope needs to be fixed, but stated that it hadn't identified a source of funds. Per a November 29, 2021 email from Alexis Ward, Project Manager, Capital Improvement Division of RPD: "We do not yet have a funding source identified and this will be the main hurdle to initiating the project. RPD has a number of outstanding ADA improvement projects and we have a small annual allocation of funding to put towards these." (Emphasis added.)

In the ensuing years, there were emails back and forth between RPD and me, including a detailed description of the project (which also includes curb ramps on JFK Drive) from RPD and an email of March 29, 2024 from RPD indicating it hoped to begin construction by the end of 2024. The timeline has slipped. On June 17, 2025 Omar Davis, the new project manager, emailed me that RPD is almost ready to go out to bid and anticipates beginning construction in late summer or early fall of 2025. This means that, if the schedule doesn't slip further, the best-case scenario is that the project will be completed in late 2025 – four years after my complaint and many years after it should have been done. The delay just isn't right. RPD should have been aware of these dangerous conditions before I notified it in 2021, and should have remediated them years earlier. Making the neglect even more egregious is the fact that the sidewalk and driveway are around 100 feet from McLaren Lodge and the driveway is the entrance to a parking lot for RPD staff and visitors.

Dangerous Sidewalks at Other Locations. In April 2025 I had difficulty navigating an upended area on the narrow sidewalk on the east side of 25th Avenue between Geary and Clement. There's a second upended area on the same block that is an obstacle but not (yet) dangerous.

On the south side of California Street between Laurel and the San Francisco Fire Credit Union, and especially east of Walnut, there are several areas badly upended by tree roots. This is particularly dangerous at night because the area is poorly illuminated. I emailed the City in 2023 (they acknowledged receipt) and don't know the current status.

San Francisco's Street Tree Policy is Too Rigid, Ignores Disability Rights, and Undermines Pedestrian Safety. Per DPW's sidewalk tree removal webpage, in order to remove a sidewalk tree, there must be an inspection and written report by a certified, licensed arborist at the applicant's expense. Some trees on private property are considered "significant trees" and removal is subject to the same rules as sidewalk trees. Further, "If we recommend tree removal, a notice will be posted on the tree for 30 days. If objections to the removal are received, a public hearing will be scheduled. If we deny removal, the applicant may request a public hearing. After the hearing, a hearing officer will make a recommendation to the Public Works Director, who will issue a final decision. The Director's decision may be appealable to the Board of Appeals." Also, "Note that although a tree has caused sidewalk, sewer or other property damage, removal may not be required, and a permit may not be granted."

The tree removal permit application process requires that "For each tree removed, a tree of equal replacement value or equivalent in-lieu fee is required, unless requirement is waived in writing by the Director of Public Works. All tree removals are subject to Tree Appraisal Process." The in-lieu fee is $2,590 for each tree not planted. Also, "If a removal permit is approved, the removal of the tree is expected to be completed by the applicant and all costs associated with the removal are the responsibility of the applicant, including all costs associated with the purchase and planting of the replacement tree."

https://sfpublicworks.org/remove-street-tree <https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://sfpublicworks.org/remove-street-tree___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo0MTlkMDRmNGIzMGM5NmZlYjg1MTNlMjc2NmNlNzg5Mjo3Ojc3Yjg6YzNjZWQzMzI5YTY4ZmYzZmUyZWQ2Y2U1NmVkM2M2YmRiNDFkNWE2Yjk0NjNlMjhhY2ImMzBjNGZkMzA4M2ViNzpoOlQ6Tg>

Considering the fees, time, and effort involved and the applicant's responsibility for removing a tree and planting a replacement, it's clear that the removal process contemplates that property owners, not pedestrians, would apply to remove trees.

Essentially, San Francisco's policy is only to remove trees that are diseased or in imminent danger of falling. The process for approving removal of a sidewalk tree is lengthy, complex, expensive, and potentially contentious. Apparently, any San Francisco resident has standing to object. (Perhaps anyone in the world has standing – DPW doesn't specify who does.) A decision to remove or not remove a tree can be appealed to the Board of Appeals.. I believe that some major transportation projects were significantly delayed due to objections to removing trees; if so, this increased the projects' costs and delayed their benefits.

With overly complex, cumbersome, expensive, time-consuming, and potentially adversarial procedures like these for the removal of even a single tree, is it any wonder that San Francisco government has been so inefficient for so long? Almost certainly tree removal is only one example of San Francisco's needlessly complex, cumbersome, expensive, time-consuming, and potentially adversarial rules.

California recently enacted legislation essentially eliminating CEQA protections from the environmental impacts (air quality, groundwater quality, traffic, noise, blockage of light, objects of historical or archaeological significance, etc.) of urban housing developments seven stories and lower. Other legislation greatly reduced the ability of cities to control their zoning and the rights of residents to have input on developments, even those next door. What a bizarre juxtaposition – anyone who doesn't want one tree removed (even though it would be replaced by another) five miles from where they live has greater rights than the neighbors of a seven-story residential development that would occupy an entire block and could have monumental negative impacts that now do not even have to be studied or publicly disclosed, let alone mitigated.

The main stated justifications for eliminating CEQA protections are that CEQA compliance is cumbersome and time-consuming, enables abuse by project opponents, and makes building housing take longer and cost more. But if a project requires the removal of trees, couldn't opponents delay it and increase costs by objecting to tree removal?

https://calmatters.org/housing/2025/06/ceqa-urban-development-infill-budget/ <https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://calmatters.org/housing/2025/06/ceqa-urban-development-infill-budget/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo0MTlkMDRmNGIzMGM5NmZlYjg1MTNlMjc2NmNlNzg5Mjo3OjQ5ZDE6MzA1MTk3ZjViOTU3NDE1ZjVlMjVkYmE3ZjkzN2M3YzEwNWZjY2FlODJjNTA2YThjOWUyZGRjODVmMDVmZDRkNDpoOlQ6Tg>

San Francisco government cites obvious, indisputable reasons for planting and maintaining trees: they are beautiful; they provide shade; they absorb rainfall; they provide habitat for wildlife and for other plants; they mitigate the urban heat island effect; they combat climate change by absorbing CO2 and other greenhouse gases.

As important as these benefits are, they are not a civil right, nor are they more important than pedestrian safety. Removing inappropriate, irremediably dangerous trees and replacing them with smaller new trees of appropriate species would have a tiny effect on the benefits of trees.

As of 2017, parks covered 20% of San Francisco (I don't know whether the Presidio is included in this percentage), every resident lived within a 10-minute walk from at least one park, and San Francisco was among the two best cities in the United States in both categories. Here's a link to a Compass real estate blog describing the results of the survey, which was conducted by the nonprofit Trust for Public Land. San Francisco has added parks and other green spaces since 2017, so today's percentage is even higher. And if parks comprise more than 20%, the percentage of green space is much higher because of green space connected with buildings (backyards, front yards, gardens, roof gardens, terraces with planters, etc.), sports fields at schools and universities, and street median spaces.

https://compasscaliforniablog.com/san-francisco-is-no-1-in-the-nation-for-access-to-city-parks/ <https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://compasscaliforniablog.com/san-francisco-is-no-1-in-the-nation-for-access-to-city-parks/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo0MTlkMDRmNGIzMGM5NmZlYjg1MTNlMjc2NmNlNzg5Mjo3OjUzYmQ6MzczNDIxOWU3ZmM1YmU2YmE0ZWVlNjcyNTg5NzQ1YjVmMDFmOTM0MGI2YjUyMTE4YmNjYWIyZjUyNzY4ZDdjYTpoOlQ6Tg>

Like much in life, public policy usually requires trade-offs. California and San Francisco zoning and housing laws and policies that encourage dense residential construction will increase the urban heat island effect and reduce green space (e.g. if a single-family house with front and back yards is replaced by a four or more unit building that occupies more of the parcel). They will increase traffic congestion. Increased building height will reduce sunlight, casting shadows outside and on nearby buildings, reducing vitamin D and limiting the types of suitable plants. These impacts will be far greater than replacing dangerously overgrown trees of inappropriate species with smaller ones of appropriate species.

San Francisco removed many trees for projects such as the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit and the Masonic bike lanes and replaced them with young trees. It can and should do the same where trees are so old and their roots so badly overgrown that the adjacent sidewalk violates disability civil rights laws and jeopardizes pedestrian safety, and trimming the roots would be insufficient to create a safe, code compliant sidewalk.

Some of the Laws San Francisco Is Violating. The law could not be clearer. All citations are to California Building Code (Title 24).

Section 1111A. Changes in Level on Accessible Routes. Section 1111A.1. Changes in Level not Exceeding ½ inch. "Abrupt changes in level along accessible routes shall not exceed 1/2 inch (12.7 mm). When changes in level do occur, they shall be beveled with a slope no greater than 1 unit vertical in 2 units horizontal (50-percent slope). Changes in level not exceeding 1/4 inch (6.35 mm) may be vertical."

Section 1113A. Walks and Sidewalks on Accessible Routes. Section 1113A.1 Width and Continuous Surfaces. "Abrupt changes in level along any accessible route shall not exceed 1/2 inch (12.7 mm). When changes in level do occur, they shall be beveled with a slope no greater than 1 unit vertical in 2 units horizontal (50-percent slope). Changes in level not exceeding 1/4 inch (6.35 mm) may be vertical."

I'm not suggesting it would be feasible for San Francisco to ensure that no sidewalk has a change in level greater than 1/2 inch. But the upended sidewalks in the attached photos and others throughout the city are ridiculously, embarrassingly, and shamefully out of compliance. It isn't a grey area. Common sense and the law agree that the existing situation is a disability civil rights violation, dangerous, and untenable.

A standard sidewalk square in San Francisco is 3 feet x 3 feet. Sidewalks in California are required to have a pedestrian access route ("PAR") of at least 4 feet of clear width (Section 1113A). This means that repairing or replacing a single upended or otherwise damaged sidewalk square, or a single line of squares configured end to end parallel to the direction of travel, does not provide a required PAR. In certain places it's also relevant that when a sidewalk's clear width is less than 5 feet, clear passing spaces at least 5 feet x 5 feet must be provided at intervals of no more than 200 feet. (A passing space can include a PAR.)

Complaint. Please consider this email a formal complaint about disability civil rights laws violations and unsafe pedestrian conditions at every location mentioned herein except, as to California Street and the driveway on Stanyan, consider it a request for a detailed status update.

What Will You Do, Mayor Lurie and Supervisors? When Will You Do It? The disability civil rights laws violations and unsafe pedestrian conditions documented in this email exist elsewhere in San Francisco. And as large trees of inappropriate species continue to grow, such violations and conditions will proliferate over time. They will all get even worse if nothing effective is done. Dribbling a bit of asphalt in an attempt to smooth sharp edges is utterly inadequate. As the attached photos and BUF/DPW's inadequate response to my complaint about the sidewalk on Octavia demonstrate, the status quo of removing trees only if they are diseased beyond healing or in imminent danger of falling would enable these discriminatory and dangerous conditions to continue and worsen.

* If BUF/DPW determines that a tree is in danger of falling, doesn't the director of DPW or someone else in the department have emergency authority to authorize its removal without an arborist report, notice or a hearing? Trees that are so badly upending a sidewalk that pruning the roots and applying asphalt won't provide disability access and pedestrian safety should be treated the same way, except that the directors of DPW and ODA should have joint decision-making authority. In both situations, discretionary authority is necessary.

* Discretionary authority for both types of problems should be stated in legislation, if it isn't already. Detailed criteria should be specified. For damaged sidewalks, ODA should be consulted in developing criteria. Actions taken or not taken should be documented by photographs and in writing.

* DPW should survey sidewalk conditions throughout San Francisco and publish the results on its webpage (with links to it from ODA and MTA webpages), including interim results at six-month intervals.

* DPW/BUF should, in consultation with ODA, develop a written action plan to address bad sidewalk conditions.

* Significant funds and personnel should be allocated to these efforts ASAP.

* BUF should establish a list of approved species of trees, which would have deep roots, be relatively slow growing, and be far less likely to cause major damage to sidewalks. Existing lists should be reviewed.

* The Recreation and Parks Department's capital budget for disability access projects – which they admit is small – should be significantly increased ASAP.

This is a golden opportunity for San Francisco government to show it can be effective in solving daily, nuts and bolts problems. Although there is a budget deficit, fixing the problems discussed in this email should be considered risk management and analogous to addressing long-deferred maintenance. If you care about safe sidewalks and streets, please show it.

Sincerely

Howard Chabner

Item 36

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: Webster bike lane repainted dangerously with significantly less space
Date:	Thursday, July 31, 2025 11:10:58 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding Webster Street.

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: Dylan Harris <teradyl@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2025 10:01 AM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MTABoard@sfmta.com; Kirschbaum, Julie (MTA) <Julie.Kirschbaum@sfmta.com>; Wise, Viktoriya (MTA) <Viktoriya.A.Wise@sfmta.com>; Nhan, Leanne (MTA) <Leanne.Nhan@sfmta.com>; Leung, Kimberly (MTA) <Kimberly.Leung@sfmta.com>; Sweet, Alexandra C. (MYR) <alexandra.c.sweet@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Webster bike lane repainted dangerously with significantly less space

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

Hello,

I'm here requesting that the Webster street bike lane be brought back to the status quo before the construction earlier this year. There used to be a bike lane plus a buffer that made me feel quite safe riding on Webster and not forcing me into the door zone of parked cars. As you can see from this picture, the bike lane was repainted (in the foreground block) without the buffer (as seen in the subsequent background blocks). Please bring this bike lane back to what it was before!! Very important for safety! Cars are driving closer to the bike lane in an unnecessarily wide car lane and pushing me closer to car doors.

When will this be fixed? All I'm asking for is paint so it should be easy and fast.

Thank you,
Dylan
732 Fell St.

Eddy
AHEAD

Item 37

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: Opposition to the Appeal at 1979 Mission Street, Board File #250735
Date:	Monday, July 28, 2025 1:24:00 PM
Attachments:	Appeal at 1979 Mission Street, Board File #250735.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from United to Save the Mission, the San Francisco Latino Task Force, and the San Francisco Latino Parity and Equity Coalition regarding File No. 250735, which is Item No. 56 on tomorrow's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

File No. 250735: Hearing of persons interested in or objecting to the decision of Public Works, dated June 25, 2025, approving a Tentative Parcel Map for a three-lot subdivision at 1979 Mission Street, Assessor's Parcel Block No. 3553, Lot No. 052. (District 9) (Appellant: Ali Gilmore) (Filed: July 3, 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: factory 1 design <design@factory1.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 3:28 PM
To: Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <stephen.sherrill@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <chyanne.chen@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Starr, Aaron (CPC) <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>
Subject: Opposition to the Appeal at 1979 Mission Street, Board File #250735

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

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors -

Please find the attached letter from United to Save the Mission, Latino Task Force and the SF Latino Parity and Equity Coalition regarding the appeal at 1979 Mission Street.

Sincerely,
Larisa Pedroncelli
member, United to Save the Mission
chair, Latino Task Force Street Needs Committee

July 25, 2025

RE: Tentative Map Appeal at 1979 Mission Street, Board File #250735

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors -

It has come to our attention that an appeal has been filed to prevent the three-lot subdivision at 1979 Mission in order to block the affordable housing project, La Maravilla, at this site.

As many of you know, the Latino and American Indian community of the Mission, led by the Plaza 16 Coalition, fought for years to acquire 1979 Mission for desperately needed affordable housing in our community that has been devastated by gentrification and has seen the displacement of over 14,000 Mission residents, many of whom were displaced into homelessness during the fight for this site.

The multi-ethnic cultural reality of the Mission District leads our community members to stay in their neighborhood where they find a language and cultural identification. The Mission District becomes their home and their universe. It is therefore natural that when these existing residents are evicted, lose their jobs, or experience a sudden trauma that leads to displacement and homelessness, that they stay close.

In addition to fighting for affordable housing sites for our neighbors who have been displaced outside the Mission, into conditions of overcrowding or into the street, our community has long fought - and continues to fight - for an effective plan that will help the city pivot to a holistic solution to homelessness focused on securing supportive and stable housing for our most vulnerable neighbors. This includes fighting for the acquisition of permanently supportive housing (PSH) sites.

It is well documented that housing is a key factor in healing from trauma and health related conditions, including substance abuse disorder. **Supportive housing that meets the needs of formerly unhoused residents is not a harbinger of homelessness or crime.** It is a key part of the solution for helping individuals exit homelessness. Evidence from years of research shows that PSH provides cost-effective housing and supportive services to help people experiencing chronic homelessness remain stably housed.[1] [2]

---

[1] Terner Center for Housing Innovation, *Permanent Supportive Housing: Building On What Works To End Chronic Homelessness,* University of California Berkeley (January 7, 2025). https://ternercenter.berkeley.edu/research-and-policy/permanent-supportive-housing-building-on-what-works-to-end-chronic-homelessness/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

[2] Kurtzman, Laura, *Study Finds Permanent Supportive Housing is Effective for Highest Risk Chronically Homeless People,* University of California San Francisco (September 17, 2020).

Today, American Indian people continue to experience the highest rates of homelessness and some of the most severe health disparities in San Francisco. For the American Indian community, this site and the surrounding neighborhood hold deep significance, not only because of our historic connection to the land, but because of the legacy of relocation that brought many Native families to San Francisco in search of a better life. Today, this community has persevered, particularly in the Mission District, where we have the first American Indian Cultural District, a milestone that represents decades of advocacy, resilience, and cultural preservation. Affordable housing like La Maravilla is urgently needed to support our elders, unhoused youth, and single individuals who are trying to remain in the communities they helped build.

It is also critical that affordable housing and permanently supportive housing projects like La Maravilla be built on transit rich corridors because **data supports the long recognized actuality that low-income residents, unlike their wealthy counterparts, are less likely to own vehicles, instead relying on public transit systems such as MUNI and BART.** [3] [4]

Affordable housing at this site will also relieve the use of vehicles by displaced residents who currently commute to the Mission to keep their children in their schools of origin, maintain their jobs and maintain connections with their community. As an example, a family from our community that was displaced to Napa was able to secure an apartment utilizing a housing voucher at 15th and Mission that allowed them to end their daily 4 hour car commute between Napa and San Francisco. Their child now walks to school and the parents use public transit to get to work downtown.

Lastly, the Mission District has maintained community processes and robust conversations for all of our affordable housing sites, and La Maravilla is no different. It is during these conversations, including open community meetings, that we co-create with our affordable housing developers to advance the vision of contextual and culturally resonant projects that reflect the community in which these projects are developed. Affordable housing like La Maravilla is urgently needed to support our elders, unhoused youth, and single individuals who are trying to remain in the communities they helped build.

We ask that Supervisors unanimously vote against this thinly veiled attempt to subvert the Latino and American Indian communities in their process to co-create the affordable and permanently supportive housing for which we have long fought. The process is open to all neighbors, and we hope that neighbors with concerns will work within this communal process rather than taking outside actions to undermine our self-determination.

Sincerely,

United to Save the Mission
San Francisco Latino Task Force
San Francisco Latino Parity and Equity Coalition

---

https://www.ucsf.edu/news/2020/09/418546/study-finds-permanent-supportive-housing-effective-highest-risk-chronically

[3] Christopher, Ben, *How gentrification is killing the bus: California's rising rents are pushing out commuters*, Cal Matters (May 29, 2025). https://calmatters.org/housing/2025/05/la-gentrification-public-transit/

[4] Boarnet M., Eisenlohr A., Bostic R.W., Rodnyansky S., Burinskiy E., Jamme H., Santiago-Barolomei R., *Rich versus Poor, Near versus Far from Transit: Who Travels More?*, Transfers Magazine, Issue 7 (Spring 2021). https://transfersmagazine.org/magazine-article/issue-7/rich-versus-poor-near-versus-far-from-transit-who-travels-more/

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; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: YES on board agenda item 250737
Date:	Tuesday, July 29, 2025 8:10:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Barbara Dwyer regarding File No. 250737, which is Item No. 58 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

File No. 250737: Motion conditionally disapproving the decision of Public Works and disapproving the Tentative Parcel Map for a three-lot subdivision at 1979 Mission Street, Assessor's Parcel Block No. 3553, Lot No. 052, subject to the Board of Supervisors' adoption of written findings in support of the disapproval.

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: BARBARA DWYER <montereydivingwoman@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 3:57 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Subject: YES on board agenda item 250737

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

To the Supervisors:

I fully support the Capp St neighbors who are objecting to the proposed development at 1979 Mission Street. It is yet another dumping of the volitionally homeless, untreated drug addicts, and severely mentally ill in our neighborhood without any preconditions regarding sobriety or compliance with the law.

Does anyone at City Hall even consider the needs of taxpaying San Franciscans anymore? We are continuously guilt tripped to throw money down the failed "Housing First" rathole. We're forced to support conditions that are destroying our neighborhoods and quality of life.

Designate the development for formerly homeless families who have an incentive to succeed. We do not need more lawlessness in the Mission.

Barbara J Dwyer

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: Vote No on Fiscally Irresponsible Ordinance to Mandate Homeless Shelters in Every District
Date: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 9:11:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Adrienne Hoyer regarding File No. 250487, which is Item No. 31 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

> **File No. 250487:** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to promote equitable access to shelter and behavioral health services by prohibiting the City from siting a new, City-funded homeless shelter, transitional housing facility, or certain behavioral health residential care and treatment facilities (collectively, "Covered Facilities") in a neighborhood where the neighborhood's share of the City's shelter and transitional housing beds exceeds the neighborhood's share of the City's unsheltered persons, and prohibiting the City from siting a new City-funded homeless shelter within 300 feet of an existing homeless shelter; and authorizing the Board of Supervisors to waive these prohibitions upon a finding that approving the Covered Facility or homeless shelter at the proposed location is in the public interest; and providing that this ordinance shall sunset on December 31, 2031. (Mahmood, Walton, Dorsey, Sauter, 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: Adrienne Hoyer <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 12:11 PM
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: Vote No on Fiscally Irresponsible Ordinance to Mandate Homeless Shelters in Every District

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	Adrienne Hoyer
Email	amhoyer@sbcglobal.net
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,

Item 40

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); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Item 63 Request Continuance for Use Limits
Date:	Tuesday, July 29, 2025 3:47:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Christin Evans regarding File No. 250634, which is Item No. 63 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

> **File No. 250634:** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to eliminate limits on Non-Residential Use Sizes in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD), Polk Street NCD, West Portal Avenue NCD, North Beach NCD and North Beach Special Use District, Regional Commercial Districts, and Residential-Commercial District; allow specified Non-Residential Uses that exceed the Use Size limits to divide into smaller spaces that may continue to exceed the Use Size limits, without conditional use authorization; adjust the Use Size limit in all NCDs to a round number; 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 findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare pursuant to Planning Code, Section 302. (Melgar, Sherrill, Sauter)

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: Christin Evans <christin@booksmith.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 3:45 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Item 63 Request Continuance for Use Limits

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Yesterday, we heard from fellow merchants that their associations had serious concerns about the change in Use Size Limits legislation.

We believe there has not yet been adequate amount of time for local neighborhood groups to be consulted and their concerns addressed. Specifically, some of the groups mentioned that they've not yet had the opportunity to meet with their board members since being alerted to the legislation and proposed changes to their community.

Respectfully, I am writing to ask that there be a continuance of this item so there is sufficient time for outreach to the various merchant groups in the neighborhood corridors that would be impacted.

Sincerely,
Christin Evans
Small Business Forward

Item 41

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: Fireworks epidemic in San Francisco
Date:	Friday, August 1, 2025 10:41:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Jonathan Weisman regarding fireworks.

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: Jonathan Weisman <jonathan.r.weisman@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2025 2:47 PM
To: Press, DEM (DEM) <dempress@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Fireworks epidemic in San Francisco

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

For your record, here are pictures of the fireworks and burn scar after 4th of July on Bernal Hill. We are extremely lucky this was not worse. Again, by the city not taking action on fireworks we are risking an LA-like fire all the time. Please take action.

On Mon, Jun 23, 2025 at 8:08 PM Jonathan Weisman <jonathan.r.weisman@gmail.com> wrote:

> To San Francisco leadership:
>
> As a two decade resident of San Francisco, I am immensely disappointed by the city's lack of action in addressing the epidemic of illegal fireworks in San Francisco. The Civil Grand Jury last year already highlighted the grave health and safety risks. Unfortunately, Mayor Breed in her lack of leadership declined to support most of the recommendations in the report.
>
> Not only is the health of the city's veterans, children, and pets at risk but also with climate change **we are at risk of an LA-fire like situation.** Be reminded that the LA fires near Palisades were likely started by New Year's fireworks activities. At least 30 people died and over 16,000 homes were destroyed.
>
> Bernal Hill is one of the most intense locations for illegal firework activity. This also happens to be an open grassland area which turns golden brown and dry after the spring. Right now it is an absolute tinderbox. Given the hill's prominence and ease of access, this is one of the most popular spots to shoot off illegal fireworks. As a nearby resident, I can confirm that we

have had TWO WEEKS of daily fireworks - and it's not even July yet.

Mayor Breed's responses to the Grand Jury's report were made public here. I am writing to ask that Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Fielder (as the supervisor representing this area) take action as committed by the Mayor's Office. This includes:

- (Overdue) R5.1: By **December 1, 2024**, the Controller's Office shall instruct its Performance Program Team to identify meaningful illegal fireworks data and require impacted departments in public health and public safety to collect it.
- (Overdue) R3.1: develop and facilitate the publication and distribution of educational materials on the dangers to self, harms to others and the environment, and the laws and penalties associated with illegal fireworks. Such information shall be designed and published by **May 1, 2025**.

Finally, please consider these recommendations for specifically curbing Bernal Hill fireworks:

1. SFPD patrols of Bernal Heights Blvd: a periodic, visible presence by simply circling Bernal Heights Blvd. could deter fireworks.
2. Training for Non-Emergency Responders: frequently when neighbors report illegal firework activity to Non-emergency, they do not know where Bernal Hill is located. They ask as if we know precisely where these fireworks are being deployed. Bernal Hill is several acres and fireworks are deployed everywhere. When filing a report, Bernal Heights should be an easily identified option for callers to report and responding officers should patrol Bernal Heights Blvd as above.
3. Signs and deterrents: signs and fake video cameras could deter firework activities.
4. Implement the Fireworks working group as identified in the Grand Jury's report.
5. Restrict or reduce officially approved fireworks shows from the SF Giants and other official venues. It was absolutely absurd that earlier this year a private party was permitted a massive fireworks show.

I understand there are many people with many needs in this city. However, this issue impacts every single resident in the city for all of the months of June, July, August, December, January and countless nights in between. Almost half of all evenings in the city are unbearable and there is an added tax of renting a hotel room outside the city to avoid. Please help.

Jonathan
District 9

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: SUPER URGENT / IMMEDIATE REVIEW REQ: Re: Fwd: Your Interest in Renting at Quincy in San Francisco
Date:	Friday, August 1, 2025 10:45:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Han Lee regarding San Francisco's Below Market Rate Housing Program.

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: Han Lee <han.lee.personal@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2025 1:17 AM
To: Geithman, Kyra (MYR) <kyra.geithman@sfgov.org>; Moore, Janisha (MYR) <Janisha.Moore@sfgov.org>; Reyes Segura <reyess@sfcenter.org>; Sean Spangenberg <sspangenberg@conard.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Ebadi, Mahanaz (BOS) <mahanaz.ebadi@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Support <attorneycoordinator@legalplans.com>; MetLife Legal Plans <clientservice@legalplans.com>; dan.bernal@mail.house.gov; Reyes Segura <reyess@sfcenter.org>; intake@baylegal.com; marc.price.wolf@sfcityatty.org; SFhousingInfo <sfhousinginfo@sfgov.org>; bea.dinsmore@mail.house.gov; David Latt <david.latt@mail.house.gov>; Izzie Hallock <izzie.hallock@asm.ca.gov>; senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Rental Assistance Program Application Updates <appupdates@catholiccharitiessf.org>
Subject: Re: SUPER URGENT / IMMEDIATE REVIEW REQ: Re: Fwd: Your Interest in Renting at Quincy in San Francisco

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

Hi all (- taking off seemingly untimely or non-material stakeholders at this point in time, while adding SF City attorney office + Bea from Speaker Pelosi office, and Bay Area Legal intake

team)

Another sleepless night thanks to Quincy. I took the liberty of doing a deep analysis and wanted to share my key findings with you with city-published materials along with key precedents:

Expert Legal Guidance for San Francisco BMR Lottery Winners: Navigating Landlord Overreach and City Regulations

I. Introduction: Understanding Your Rights as a BMR Lottery Winner in San Francisco

San Francisco's housing market presents unique challenges, particularly for individuals and families seeking affordable living options. The city has implemented various programs to address this, with the Below Market Rate (BMR) housing initiative standing as a cornerstone. For a renter who has legally secured a BMR unit through a lottery, understanding the intricacies of this program and the legal protections afforded to them is paramount, especially when facing potential landlord misconduct.

Overview of San Francisco's Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Program

San Francisco's Inclusionary Housing Program, established in 2002, is a critical mechanism designed to foster housing affordability. This program mandates that new residential developments comprising 10 or more units either contribute to an Affordable Housing Fee or allocate a specific percentage of their units as "below market rate" (BMR) housing. These BMR units are then offered at prices affordable to low or middle-income households, directly addressing the broader impact of market-rate housing on the city's affordability landscape.[1]
The allocation of these highly sought-after BMR units, whether for purchase or rental, is frequently managed through a transparent lottery system. This system is designed to provide equitable access to affordable housing opportunities for qualified individuals and families, ensuring fairness in distribution.[3]
Central to the administration and oversight of the BMR program is the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD). This vital city department is tasked with coordinating San Francisco's housing policy, facilitating the financing for the development and

rehabilitation of affordable housing, and, critically, monitoring the long-term affordability and physical integrity of the city's affordable housing inventory. MOHCD also plays a direct role in assisting applicants through the process of applying for affordable housing and providing guidance to enhance their chances in the competitive housing lottery.[5]

The BMR program, while a beacon of affordability for many, can present a complex legal environment for tenants. While it offers access to significantly reduced rental costs, a tenant's security within a BMR unit is intrinsically linked to the landlord's adherence to city regulations. For instance, if a landlord is found to be in violation of BMR rules—such as illegally renting out an owner-occupied BMR unit—the tenant, despite having legally won the lottery, could face disruption or even displacement as a direct consequence of the city's enforcement actions against the landlord. This highlights a unique vulnerability that extends beyond typical landlord-tenant disputes, as the landlord's actions against the city directly impact the tenant's tenure. The BMR program, therefore, necessitates legal counsel with a profound understanding of both general tenant law and the specific intricacies of BMR program compliance.

The Unique Legal Protections for BMR Tenants

San Francisco is renowned for its robust framework of tenant protections, which significantly bolster the rights of its residential renters. Key among these is the Rent Ordinance, a municipal law that imposes limits on annual rent increases and strictly defines the "just causes" required for a landlord to initiate an eviction. This ordinance provides a substantial layer of security for the vast majority of residential tenants in the city.[7]

Further reinforcing tenant security, the "No Eviction Without Representation Act," enacted in 2018, represents a landmark commitment by the city. This act mandates that San Francisco fund legal representation for all residential tenants facing eviction proceedings. Organizations such as the Eviction Defense Collaborative (EDC) serve as lead partners in implementing this crucial program, ensuring that tenants have access to expert legal counsel regardless of their financial capacity.[10]

While a tenant's situation may involve a BMR unit, the comprehensive general tenant protections in San Francisco remain highly pertinent. The city's strong rent control and eviction safeguards [7], coupled with the "Right to Counsel" for eviction cases [10], apply broadly. This means that a BMR tenant benefits from these overarching protections in addition to the specific rules governing BMR units. A landlord's overstepping of boundaries, therefore, could involve violations of both BMR-specific regulations and general tenant laws, such as harassment or illegal eviction attempts. Consequently, a lawyer specializing in BMR cases must also possess extensive knowledge of general San Francisco tenant law, as the BMR status complements, rather than supersedes, fundamental tenant rights. A comprehensive legal strategy for a BMR tenant would involve leveraging both the specific BMR program rules and the broader tenant protections to ensure robust and multifaceted defense.

Defining Landlord Overreach in BMR Contexts

Landlord overreach in the context of Below Market Rate (BMR) units often involves fraudulent activities that directly undermine the integrity of the affordable housing program. A primary form of such misconduct is the illegal renting out of owner-occupied BMR units for market rates. This practice directly contravenes the fundamental purpose and regulations of the BMR program, which are designed to provide affordable housing to qualified individuals, not to serve as investment properties for profit.[3]

Notable instances of this type of overreach include lawsuits filed by the San Francisco City Attorney against individuals such as Catherine Bailey and Gregory Garver. These individuals allegedly violated their BMR purchase terms by illegally renting out their units, leading to significant legal action and substantial penalties from the city.[3] Such actions are a clear breach of the BMR program's core requirement that these units remain owner-occupied and are not utilized as investment or rental properties without explicit city approval.[3]

Beyond BMR-specific fraud, landlord overreach can also manifest as general tenant harassment. This includes a range of prohibited behaviors such as abusing the right of access to a rental unit, attempting to coerce or intimidate a tenant into vacating, interfering with a tenant's right to quiet enjoyment, refusing to accept lawful rent payments, or interfering with a tenant's privacy. Additionally, failure to perform necessary repairs or attempts at wrongful evictions are common forms of landlord misconduct vigorously addressed by tenant rights law firms.[2]

The situation of a landlord overstepping boundaries often involves a dual nature of misconduct, impacting both the City of San Francisco and the renter. The City Attorney's office actively prosecutes landlords for BMR fraud.[3] This represents a direct overstepping against the city's regulations. Simultaneously, these fraudulent actions (e.g., illegally renting out a unit) or other behaviors like harassment or refusal to repair constitute overstepping against the renter's rights.[2] The causality here is clear: a landlord's attempt to illegally profit from a BMR unit, in violation of city rules, frequently leads to direct harm or harassment of the tenant, violating their established tenant rights. Therefore, a successful legal strategy for a BMR tenant will likely involve demonstrating how the landlord's violations of BMR program rules simultaneously constitute violations of the tenant's rights under general landlord-tenant law. This dual violation strengthens the tenant's case and can align their interests with city enforcement actions, creating a more powerful legal position.

II. Key Legal Challenges in BMR Rental Disputes

Navigating a dispute involving a Below Market Rate (BMR) rental unit in San Francisco presents unique legal complexities. These cases often intertwine general landlord-tenant law with the

specific regulations of the city's affordable housing programs, requiring a nuanced legal approach.

Illegal Subleasing and Occupancy Violations by Landlords

A fundamental principle of the BMR program, especially for ownership units, is the requirement for owner-occupancy. The program strictly prohibits renting out these units, either partially or entirely, without explicit written approval from the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD). Such approvals are typically granted only under circumstances of demonstrated hardship and for a limited duration.[3]

The San Francisco City Attorney's office has a well-documented history of pursuing legal action against BMR owners who engage in illegal rentals. These lawsuits are not merely administrative actions; they seek substantial civil penalties, which can amount to up to $2,500 for each unlawful act and a minimum of $200 per day for violations of San Francisco's Planning Code. Furthermore, these legal actions may culminate in court orders compelling the owner to comply with the law, including the forced sale of the property to a qualified low-income household, ensuring the unit returns to its intended purpose.[3]

Crucially, such violations can be reported directly to MOHCD or via the City Attorney's Code Enforcement Hotline. These channels provide a vital pathway for tenants or concerned citizens to initiate official investigations, which can trigger significant enforcement actions.[13]

For a legally lottery-winning renter, the situation can be precarious if their landlord is illegally subleasing an owner-occupied BMR unit. While the City Attorney's actions are primarily directed against the owner for defrauding the city's program, the tenant is caught in the crossfire. The tenant's legal status could become unstable if the unit's BMR designation is revoked or if enforcement actions lead to a forced sale, potentially resulting in their displacement, even as an innocent party. However, a complaint from the tenant, or even a third party, can serve as a powerful catalyst for city enforcement. Therefore, the tenant's legal counsel must be adept at protecting the tenant's occupancy rights and seeking remedies for any damages incurred, even as the city pursues its case against the landlord for BMR fraud. This might involve strategic negotiations with the City or demonstrating the tenant's legal right to remain, separate from the landlord's fraudulent actions.

Wrongful Evictions and Harassment in BMR Units

San Francisco's legal landscape provides robust protections against landlord misconduct, particularly through its Rent Ordinance. Section 37.10B of this ordinance explicitly prohibits various forms of landlord harassment. This includes, but is not limited to, abusing the landlord's right of access into a rental unit, attempting to influence a tenant to vacate through fraud, intimidation, or coercion, interfering with a tenant's right to quiet enjoyment, refusing to accept or acknowledge lawful rent payments, refusing to cash a rent check for over 30 days,

and interfering with a tenant's privacy.[8]

Tenants who are subjected to such harassment have significant legal recourse. They can pursue substantial monetary damages, including no less than three times the actual damages suffered, which can encompass mental and emotional distress. Alternatively, statutory damages of $1,000, whichever is greater, may be awarded. Furthermore, a tenant who prevails in such a case is typically entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs, and potentially punitive damages, underscoring the seriousness with which the city views such violations.[8]

Dedicated tenant rights law firms in San Francisco frequently handle cases involving wrongful evictions. These can stem from various fraudulent schemes, such as "owner move-in" (OMI) evictions, "relative move-in" (RMI) evictions, or evictions initiated under the Ellis Act, where a landlord falsely claims an intent to exit the rental business. These firms are experienced in identifying and challenging such unlawful practices.[2]

BMR tenants, by definition, belong to low- or moderate-income households, making them particularly vulnerable to landlord harassment and wrongful evictions. Their limited financial resources, coupled with the fear of losing their affordable housing, can make them susceptible. The explicit provisions against harassment in the San Francisco Rent Ordinance [8] and the city's "Right to Counsel" for eviction cases [10] demonstrate a recognition of this vulnerability and a legal framework designed to counteract it. The fact that a tenant legally won a lottery to secure a rare and valuable BMR unit makes them a prime target for landlords seeking to reclaim the unit for higher, market-rate profits. Therefore, lawyers representing BMR tenants must be exceptionally vigilant against harassment tactics, as the stakes are considerably higher for these tenants given the scarcity and value of BMR units. The legal strategy should not only aim for compensation for damages but also prioritize preserving the tenant's right to remain in their affordable unit, leveraging all available local and state protections.

Disputes Involving the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) and City Regulations

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) plays a pivotal role in the oversight of San Francisco's BMR program. Its core mission involves coordinating the city's housing policy, providing financing for affordable housing development and rehabilitation, and, critically, monitoring and ensuring the long-term affordability and physical viability of the city's affordable housing stock. This includes managing the lottery process for BMR units and actively monitoring their occupancy to ensure compliance with program rules.[5]

The San Francisco City Attorney's Office actively enforces BMR regulations, proactively filing lawsuits against individuals who defraud the city's affordable housing system. These actions are a vital component of their broader efforts to combat the affordable housing crisis, ensuring that the limited stock of affordable housing is allocated to those who genuinely need it.[3]

Examples of City Attorney lawsuits include cases where BMR owners illegally rented out their units, directly violating the program's owner-occupancy requirements. These legal challenges highlight the city's commitment to upholding the integrity of the BMR program.[3] The City Attorney's Code Enforcement Hotline serves as a designated channel for making complaints about potential violations of San Francisco's Planning Code or other municipal codes, including abuses of the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program and BMR units, providing a direct line for reporting non-compliance.[14]

The City of San Francisco acts as both a regulator and a potential ally in BMR disputes. The user's query highlights landlord overstepping "against the City of San Francisco," indicating that the city itself has been wronged by the landlord's actions. MOHCD and the City Attorney's office are key players in enforcing BMR compliance.[3] For a BMR tenant, the city's enforcement actions against a fraudulent landlord can be a powerful tool. If the landlord's overreach involves defrauding the BMR program, the tenant's interests may align directly with the city's, creating an opportunity for a collaborative or mutually beneficial legal approach. An expert lawyer for a BMR tenant should therefore explore avenues for coordination with the City Attorney's office or MOHCD. Understanding the city's enforcement priorities and mechanisms, such as seeking penalties or mandating the sale of the unit to qualified buyers, can significantly influence the tenant's legal strategy and potential remedies, potentially leading to a more favorable and stable outcome for the tenant.

The Intersection of Tenant Rights and BMR Program Compliance

Below Market Rate (BMR) units operate under a distinct and complex legal framework that integrates general landlord-tenant laws with specific BMR program regulations. These specific BMR rules include stringent occupancy requirements, such as mandatory owner-occupancy for BMR ownership units, and limitations on renting out the unit without explicit city approval. Additionally, BMR rental units may have specific household size requirements.[3]

Crucially, the broader San Francisco tenant laws, encompassing rent control, eviction protections, habitability standards, and anti-harassment ordinances, remain fully applicable to BMR units. This means that BMR tenants benefit from the same fundamental protections as other renters in San Francisco.[7]

Legal disputes in BMR cases frequently involve a complex interplay of violations. For example, a landlord who illegally rents out an owner-occupied BMR unit—a clear violation of BMR program rules—might subsequently engage in harassment or attempt a wrongful eviction to remove the tenant. Such actions would constitute additional violations of general tenant rights, creating a multi-layered legal challenge.[8]

The complexity of BMR disputes arises from two distinct but overlapping sets of laws: general landlord-tenant laws (such as rent control, habitability, and harassment) and specific BMR program rules (such as occupancy, resale restrictions, and city oversight). A landlord's

overreach can violate both simultaneously. For instance, if a BMR owner illegally rents out their unit, violating BMR rules, and then attempts to evict the tenant without just cause, violating rent control laws, the tenant has multiple legal avenues and stronger grounds for a claim. Lawyers representing BMR tenants must be adept at navigating both regulatory frameworks. They need to identify which specific BMR rules were violated by the landlord's actions and how those actions also constitute breaches of broader tenant protections. This comprehensive approach maximizes the tenant's leverage, potential for damages, and chances of securing their housing.

III. Identifying Top Legal Counsel for BMR Tenants in San Francisco

For a BMR lottery winner facing landlord overreach, selecting the right legal counsel is a critical decision. The unique complexities of BMR cases necessitate lawyers with specialized expertise and a clear commitment to tenant advocacy.

A. Dedicated Tenant Rights Law Firms

These firms are highly recommended because they exclusively represent tenants, thereby eliminating any potential conflicts of interest that can arise when a firm represents both landlords and tenants. This singular focus ensures their undivided loyalty and expertise are directed solely towards the tenant's best interests.[2]

Tobener Ravenscroft LLP

Tobener Ravenscroft LLP is consistently recognized as a leading and highly trusted Tenants' Rights firm in California. Their extensive track record includes over 20 years of service, a remarkable $100 million recovered for clients, and an impressive 99% success rate in tenant disputes.2 A crucial distinction for clients seeking dedicated advocacy is their explicit commitment to being "tenant attorneys only," never representing landlords.2

The firm's expertise spans a wide array of tenant issues, including wrongful evictions (such as Owner Move-In and Ellis Act evictions), intractable repair issues, landlord harassment, discrimination, and, notably, disputes against "landlords, property managers, and municipalities".[2] This experience with municipalities is particularly relevant for BMR cases, which often involve city regulations and oversight. Joseph Tobener, the managing attorney, has been recognized as a California Super Lawyer, a testament to peer and professional recognition for excellence.[2] The firm also has the capacity to handle group claims for tenants, demonstrating their ability to manage complex, multi-party litigation.[18]

Tobener Ravenscroft's explicit mention of representing tenants against "municipalities" aligns directly with the complex nature of BMR disputes, where the landlord's actions often violate

both tenant rights and city regulations. This suggests they possess experience in navigating cases where the City itself might be involved, either as a party or as an enforcement body, which is highly probable in BMR disputes where city regulations are central. Their "tenant-only" policy further ensures no conflict of interest for the BMR lottery winner, guaranteeing their advocate's unwavering loyalty. This firm appears uniquely positioned to handle the multi-faceted nature of BMR disputes, where the landlord's actions often violate both tenant rights and city regulations. Their experience engaging with municipalities implies they can effectively navigate the bureaucratic and legal complexities involving the City's interests in BMR housing, offering a comprehensive approach for the tenant.

Brod Law Firm (Gregory J. Brod)

The Brod Law Firm is dedicated to protecting renters throughout Northern California, including San Francisco.7 They possess specific experience in a range of critical tenant issues, including wrongful evictions, constructive evictions, wrongful owner move-in evictions, tenant harassment, and habitability issues.7 Gregory J. Brod, the firm's principal, has extensive experience advocating for tenants subjected to landlord harassment, with particular expertise in addressing violations of San Francisco Rent Ordinance Section 37.10B, which specifically outlines prohibited landlord harassment practices.8 The firm also offers a free case evaluation, making initial legal assessment accessible to potential clients.7 While the available information does not explicitly state their handling of BMR or lottery-based housing cases, their strong general expertise in tenant harassment and eviction defense is highly relevant to common forms of landlord overreach encountered in BMR contexts.

Wolford Wayne LLP

Wolford Wayne LLP strongly emphasizes "Representing Tenants. Never Landlords," a principle backed by over 35 years of combined experience in tenant advocacy.9 Their comprehensive practice areas include tenant harassment, wrongful eviction, tenant buyouts, constructive eviction, failure to repair/maintain, and representation at Rent Board hearings.9 The firm has a proven track record of success, having successfully resolved hundreds of disputes and recovered millions of dollars on behalf of tenants.9 Furthermore, Wolford Wayne LLP maintains close alignment with prominent non-profit housing rights organizations in San Francisco, such as the San Francisco Tenants Union, Housing Rights Committee, and the Eviction Defense Collaborative. This indicates strong community ties and a deep understanding of local tenant issues.9 While their listed case results do not explicitly mention BMR or lottery-based cases, their exclusive focus on tenant representation and strong ties to tenant advocacy groups suggest a robust tenant-centric approach that would be highly beneficial for BMR tenants.

Riley Ersoff

Riley Ersoff offers free initial consultations, allowing prospective clients to discuss their cases and receive answers to their questions without upfront cost.22 The firm highlights a "proven track record of fighting for tenants' rights and holding negligent landlords accountable".22

While their listed successes often focus on specific issues such as lead poisoning, carbon monoxide, and slum housing claims, their general commitment to tenant rights and their decisive action to protect tenant interests make them a relevant consideration for BMR tenants facing various forms of landlord overreach.22

Table: Recommended Tenant-Exclusive Law Firms for BMR Cases

Firm Name	Contact Information	Key BMR/Tenant Expertise	Notable Successes/Approach
Tobener Ravenscroft LLP	Phone: 415-504-2165 (SF Office) Website: tobenerlaw.com	Tenant-only representation, Experience against municipalities, Wrongful eviction, Harassment, Rent Control, Housing Discrimination, Group Claims	Over $100M recovered for clients, 99% success rate, 20+ years of service, Joseph Tobener named Super Lawyer
Brod Law Firm (Gregory J. Brod)	Phone: (800) 427-7020 Website: brodfirm.com	Tenant-only representation, Wrongful eviction, Constructive eviction, Tenant harassment (SF Rent Ordinance Sec. 37.10B), Habitability issues	Free case evaluation, Extensive experience fighting landlord harassment
Wolford Wayne LLP	Phone: (415) 649-6203 Website: wolford-wayne.com	Tenant-only representation, Tenant harassment, Wrongful eviction, Tenant buyouts, Failure to repair/maintain, Rent Board Hearings	Over 35 years combined experience, Recovered millions for tenants, Close alignment with non-profit housing rights organizations
Riley Ersoff	Phone: (888) 658-9695 (English), (888) 913-7561 (Spanish) Website: rileyersoff.com	Tenant rights advocacy, Holding negligent landlords accountable, Slum housing claims, Decisive action to protect tenant interests	Free initial consultation, Proven track record in fighting for tenant rights

B. Non-Profit Legal Aid and Advocacy Organizations

These organizations provide invaluable support, often offering free or low-cost legal services and counseling, particularly for low-income tenants, including those involved in affordable housing disputes. They serve as critical resources for access to justice.

Eviction Defense Collaborative (EDC)

The Eviction Defense Collaborative (EDC) is a designated lead partner for San Francisco's "Tenant Right to Counsel" program. In this capacity, EDC provides free legal representation

and support to tenants facing eviction, ensuring that individuals facing the loss of their homes have access to legal counsel.10 Their comprehensive services extend beyond direct legal assistance to include rental assistance, which helps tenants avoid homelessness, and advocacy for shelter clients, addressing a broad spectrum of housing insecurity issues.10 EDC has demonstrated remarkable effectiveness in eviction prevention, boasting a 93% success rate in keeping clients housed through the Tenant Right to Counsel initiative.11 While the available information does not explicitly detail services specifically tailored for BMR tenants, their general eviction defense for low-income tenants and their central role in the city's "Right to Counsel" program strongly indicate their relevance and utility for BMR tenants facing eviction or other landlord disputes.

EDC's core mission of eviction defense and providing free legal representation for tenants facing eviction [10]positions them as a critical immediate resource for preventing homelessness. Their high success rate in keeping clients housed [11] further underscores their value. Even if they do not specialize solely in BMR cases, their general expertise in San Francisco eviction law and their connections to other Legal Service Organizations (LSOs) through the Tenant Right to Counsel program [11] make them an essential first point of contact for any BMR tenant facing a landlord dispute that could escalate to eviction. For a BMR lottery winner, immediate access to legal aid like EDC can be crucial to prevent homelessness and stabilize their housing situation while more specialized BMR legal strategies are developed. They can provide initial defense, offer crucial advice, and potentially refer the tenant to other experts if the case requires specific BMR program litigation.

Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco (HRC)

The Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco (HRC) provides "self-help" tenants' rights counseling, offering vital information on relevant laws, available resources, and referrals to empower tenants to understand and assert their rights.23 HRC also assists with applications for Section 8 and Public Housing, as well as rent board petitions, demonstrating their familiarity with various affordable housing mechanisms.23 Their services include free counseling for tenants in "all types of housing," a broad definition that can encompass BMR units.10 While the available information does not explicitly mention specialized counseling or legal representation specifically for BMR lottery winners, their general counseling and referral services are invaluable for initial guidance and understanding of tenant rights.

Bay Area Legal Aid (BayLegal)

Bay Area Legal Aid (BayLegal) offers free legal advice through a dedicated hotline for qualified low-income residents across the Bay Area, including San Francisco.24 Their "Housing Preservation" practice specifically addresses critical issues such as evictions, discrimination, habitability concerns, and cases involving public and subsidized housing, including Section 8 and HUD-subsidized projects.24 Eligibility for BayLegal's services is typically based on income restrictions, ensuring that support is directed towards those most in need of legal assistance.24 Although the available information does not explicitly mention services for BMR

lottery winners, their focus on subsidized housing and eviction defense for low-income individuals makes them highly relevant for BMR tenants.

Other Fair Housing Advocacy Organizations

SF.gov lists several other organizations that may offer relevant services depending on the tenant's specific circumstances. These include Asian Americans Advancing Justice - Asian Law Caucus, which provides housing advocacy for low-income residents; the Independent Living Resource Center of San Francisco, offering advocacy and support services specifically for people with disabilities; and Legal Assistance to the Elderly, which provides free legal services for senior and disabled San Francisco residents.28 These organizations, while not exclusively focused on BMR, contribute to the broader ecosystem of tenant support in San Francisco.

Table: Key Legal Aid and Advocacy Resources for BMR Tenants

Organization Name	Contact Information	Services Offered	Eligibility Considerations
Eviction Defense Collaborative (EDC)	Phone: (415) 947-0797, (415) 659-9184 (Legal Assistance Line) Website: evictiondefense.org	Free Legal Representation, Rental Assistance, Shelter Client Advocacy, Eviction Defense	San Francisco tenants facing eviction, Low-income (implicit for Right to Counsel)
Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco (HRC)	Phone: (415) 703-8644, (415) 947-9085 Website: hrcsf.org	"Self-help" counseling, Resources & Referrals, Assistance with Section 8/Public Housing applications, Rent Board petitions	All renters of public and private housing
Bay Area Legal Aid (BayLegal)	Phone: (800) 551-5554 (Legal Advice Line) Website: baylegal.org	Free Legal Advice, Housing Preservation (eviction, discrimination, habitability, subsidized housing), Fair Housing Enforcement	Qualified low-income residents, Eligibility based on income and other factors
Asian Americans Advancing Justice - Asian Law Caucus	Phone: 415-896-1701 Address: 55 Columbus Ave, SF	Housing advocacy for low-income residents	Low-income residents (implicit)
Independent Living	Phone: 415-543-6222	Advocacy, Information, Support	People with

Resource Center of San Francisco	Address: 825 Howard St, SF	services for people with disabilities	disabilities
Legal Assistance to the Elderly	Phone: 415-538-3333 Address: 701 Sutter St, 2nd Fl, SF	Free legal services for senior and disabled San Francisco residents	Senior and disabled San Francisco residents

C. Firms to Approach with Caution (or Avoid for Tenant Representation)

When seeking legal representation for a BMR tenant dispute, it is crucial to understand that not all law firms are equally suited for this specific type of advocacy. Certain firm structures or specializations may present inherent conflicts of interest or a misalignment of expertise.

Firms Representing Both Landlords and Tenants

While some law firms, such as Steven Adair MacDonald & Partners, P.C. 30 and Volkov Law Firm, Inc. 21, publicly state that they handle both landlord and tenant issues, this dual representation can inherently create a conflict of interest when a tenant is in an adversarial dispute with their landlord. Dedicated tenant rights firms explicitly advise against using "dual-party attorneys," emphasizing that a firm cannot truly serve two masters in an adversarial legal context.2

The core of a BMR tenant's query involves a dispute where the landlord is "overstepping its boundaries." This is, by nature, an adversarial situation. A firm that represents both landlords and tenants, even if they claim to maintain strict ethical walls, inherently faces a conflict of interest when advocating strongly for one side against the other. Their institutional knowledge, past client relationships with landlords, or even the appearance of impartiality could subtly influence their approach or create a perception of bias, even if unintentional. For a BMR tenant, who is often in a vulnerable position against a landlord potentially committing fraud against the city, undivided loyalty and aggressive advocacy from their legal counsel are paramount. Therefore, it is crucial for BMR tenants to seek counsel from firms that exclusively represent tenants to ensure their advocate's interests are 100% aligned with their own, especially given the high stakes of BMR housing and the potential for complex litigation involving city regulations.

Firms Primarily Focused on Development/Land Use

Certain firms, such as Gubb and Barshay LLP 34 and Lubin Olson & Niewiadomski LLP 21, specialize in affordable housing finance, development, and land use. Their clientele often includes non-profit and for-profit developers or public agencies involved in creating affordable housing projects. Similarly, Ofer Elitzur at Cox, Castle & Nicholson 36 focuses on transactional project finance for affordable housing developers, structuring complex financings. Jeffer Mangels Butler & Mitchell LLP 37 also specializes in California's complex housing development laws, assisting developers and property owners with entitlements, regulatory

challenges, and litigation related to housing development.
While these firms are indeed experts in "affordable housing," their expertise lies in the development, financing, and regulatory compliance aspects for developers and public agencies. Their understanding of BMR programs is from the perspective of creating and maintaining affordable housing stock for owners and developers, not from the perspective of an individual tenant fighting for their rights within that system against a non-compliant landlord. The user's need is for litigation and advocacy against a landlord for overreach, not for transactional or development-related legal advice. It is important for BMR tenants to distinguish between "affordable housing law" in the context of real estate development and "affordable housing tenant rights." While both relate to affordable housing, the specific legal skills and client focus required are different. The user needs the latter, and these firms, while experts in their specialized field, are not the appropriate fit for direct tenant representation in disputes.

IV. The Role of the City of San Francisco in BMR Enforcement

The City of San Francisco plays a multifaceted and active role in upholding the integrity of its Below Market Rate (BMR) housing program. This involves both administrative oversight and robust legal enforcement, particularly when landlords attempt to exploit the system.

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) Oversight

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) is central to the city's affordable housing strategy. Its fundamental mission encompasses coordinating San Francisco's housing policy, providing crucial financing for the development and rehabilitation of affordable housing, and, critically, monitoring and ensuring the long-term affordability and physical viability of the city's affordable housing stock.[5]MOHCD is responsible for administering various financing programs and diligently monitoring compliance with federal and local requirements for affordable housing units.[5]
Beyond its administrative functions, MOHCD also provides direct counseling and assistance for individuals applying for affordable housing, including offering guidance on how to improve their chances in the highly competitive housing lottery.[6] Significantly, the office serves as a primary point of contact for housing-related inquiries and, importantly, for reporting fraud concerning BMR violations and illegal rentals. This demonstrates MOHCD's active and proactive role in enforcing program compliance.[19]
MOHCD's explicit mandate to monitor and ensure the long-term affordability and viability of

BMR units positions it as the central administrative authority responsible for the program's integrity. When a landlord oversteps, particularly in ways that violate BMR program rules (such as illegal subleasing of an owner-occupied unit), MOHCD is the direct entity whose regulations are being flouted or who is being defrauded. Their dedicated hotline for reporting fraud [19] further confirms their enforcement role. For a BMR tenant, understanding MOHCD's role is crucial. Reporting issues to MOHCD can initiate an administrative process that might complement or even precede formal legal action. A lawyer should advise on how to best leverage MOHCD's oversight and enforcement mechanisms to the tenant's advantage, as official city findings can significantly bolster a tenant's legal claim.

San Francisco City Attorney's Office: Prosecuting BMR Fraud

The San Francisco City Attorney's Office maintains a significant and active presence in housing enforcement and tenant protection, particularly in its vigorous efforts to combat the city's affordable housing crisis. This office actively pursues legal action by filing lawsuits against "unscrupulous slumlords and landowners" and "affordable housing fraudsters".[20]

The City Attorney's office has a well-documented history of filing lawsuits against BMR owners who illegally rent out their units, alleging direct violations of the BMR program's owner-occupancy requirements. These cases are central to their broader mission of ensuring that the city's limited affordable housing stock is allocated to those who genuinely need it, rather than being exploited for illicit profit.[3]

These lawsuits typically allege severe violations, including unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices, breaches of the city's Planning Code, and the creation of a public nuisance. The City seeks substantial penalties in these cases, often totaling hundreds of thousands of dollars, and pursues court orders requiring compliance, which can include forcing the sale of the unit to a qualified low-income household, thereby restoring the unit to its intended purpose.[3] The City Attorney's Code Enforcement Hotline is a designated channel for making complaints about potential violations of San Francisco's Planning Code or other municipal codes, including abuses of the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program and BMR units, providing a direct avenue for concerned citizens to report issues.[14]

The City Attorney's direct legal action against BMR fraudsters [3] demonstrates a strong, institutional commitment to protecting the BMR program's integrity and ensuring its intended beneficiaries receive housing. The substantial penalties sought, including hundreds of thousands of dollars and forced sale of units, serve as a significant deterrent. This means that the City Attorney's interests are often directly aligned with a BMR tenant who is a victim of a landlord's BMR fraud, such as illegal rental. Therefore, a BMR tenant's legal strategy should strongly consider coordinating with or informing the City Attorney's office. While the City Attorney represents the city's interests, their enforcement actions against the landlord could significantly strengthen the tenant's position, potentially leading to a resolution that benefits

the tenant, such as the landlord being forced to comply, sell the unit, or face severe financial penalties. This can stabilize the tenant's occupancy or provide strong leverage for a favorable settlement.

How Tenant Complaints Can Trigger City Action

The process of triggering city enforcement against BMR violations often begins with a complaint from a concerned party. Complaints regarding BMR violations can be directly submitted to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) or through the City Attorney's Code Enforcement Hotline.[13]The City Attorney's office actively investigates and prosecutes property owners found to be in violation of housing laws, demonstrating that such complaints are taken seriously and can lead to official action.[20]

A notable example illustrates the impact of such complaints: a homeowner's association complaint regarding disruptive behavior from the occupant of an illegally rented BMR unit directly led to the San Francisco City Attorney's lawsuit against the fraudulent owner.[13] This highlights that even indirect complaints or information can trigger comprehensive investigations and legal action by the City, underscoring the importance of reporting suspected violations.

The information indicates that the City actively prosecutes BMR fraud.[3] The mechanism for initiating these enforcement actions frequently begins with a complaint from a concerned party.[13] This means that the individual tenant, even if only indirectly affected by the landlord's fraud against the city, possesses significant agency. By reporting violations, the tenant can initiate a process that could lead to substantial legal and financial consequences for the landlord, thereby contributing to the broader integrity of the BMR program. A lawyer should educate the BMR tenant about their ability to report violations to the City. This includes explaining the potential impact of such reports on both the landlord's legal standing with the City and the tenant's own case. This can be a strategic move to apply additional pressure on the landlord, potentially leading to a quicker and more favorable resolution for the tenant.

V. Navigating the Legal Process: Steps for BMR Tenants

For a BMR tenant facing a dispute involving landlord overreach and potential city regulation violations, a structured approach to the legal process is essential. Each step, from initial consultation to understanding potential remedies, plays a crucial role in protecting one's housing rights.

Initial Consultation and Case Evaluation

A crucial first step for any BMR tenant facing a dispute is to seek professional legal advice.

Many reputable tenant rights firms and legal aid organizations in San Francisco offer free initial consultations or case evaluations. This allows tenants to understand their rights and explore legal options without an upfront financial commitment, which is often a significant barrier for individuals in affordable housing.[7] During this consultation, experienced attorneys will assess the specifics of the situation, advise on the tenant's legal rights under both general tenant law and the specific BMR regulations, and recommend decisive actions to protect their interests.[22] The complexity of BMR cases, which involve both general tenant law and specific city regulations (such as MOHCD rules and City Attorney enforcement actions), means that a generic landlord-tenant lawyer might not possess the necessary specialized knowledge. The availability of free consultations removes a significant financial barrier for potentially vulnerable BMR tenants. Early consultation allows for a proper assessment of the specific BMR rules violated, the landlord's overreach against the city, and the potential impact on the tenant's housing security. This proactive step can significantly influence the outcome. Therefore, it is important to emphasize that BMR tenants should seek legal advice immediately upon suspecting landlord overreach, leveraging free consultations to find a lawyer with specific BMR and city enforcement experience. This proactive approach can prevent escalation of the dispute, protect the tenant's unique position as a lottery winner, and ensure that all available legal avenues are explored.

Gathering Documentation and Evidence

Comprehensive documentation is paramount in any landlord-tenant dispute, and it is especially critical in complex BMR cases due to the interplay of multiple legal frameworks. Tenants should diligently collect and organize all relevant papers, including:

- Any eviction notices or other formal notices received from the landlord or property manager, noting the precise dates of receipt.[23]
- The original lease or rental agreement, along with any amendments or addendums.
- All written communications, including emails, letters, and text messages, exchanged with the landlord, property manager, or any relevant city agencies such as MOHCD.
- Crucially, evidence confirming the BMR status of the unit and the tenant's legal lottery win. This includes lottery confirmation documents, BMR program agreements, and initial occupancy paperwork. This documentation is unique to BMR cases and is vital for establishing the unit's regulated status and the tenant's legitimate claim to it.
- Detailed documentation of any landlord harassment, including specific dates, times, descriptions of actions, and the names of any witnesses. This is essential for claims brought under San Francisco Rent Ordinance Section 37.10B, which specifically addresses landlord harassment.[8]
- Evidence of substandard living conditions, if applicable, such as dated photographs,

videos, and records of communication with the landlord regarding repair requests. This supports claims related to habitability.[9]

Beyond standard tenant-landlord evidence, BMR cases require specific documentation related to the BMR program itself. This includes proof of the lottery win, BMR program agreements, and any communications with MOHCD regarding the unit's status or the landlord's compliance. The city's active involvement in BMR enforcement [3] means that official records related to the unit's BMR designation and the landlord's adherence (or lack thereof) to BMR rules are crucial evidence. This type of evidence can often be obtained through public records requests or discovery in litigation. A lawyer specializing in BMR cases will guide the tenant on gathering this BMR-specific evidence, as this data can be pivotal in demonstrating the landlord's fraud against the City, thereby strengthening the tenant's case and potentially leading to more significant remedies or a more favorable resolution.

Understanding Potential Legal Remedies

In a BMR dispute involving landlord overreach, a tenant may be able to pursue a variety of legal remedies, leveraging both general tenant protections and BMR-specific enforcement mechanisms.

- Monetary Damages: For proven landlord harassment, tenants can recover substantial monetary damages. This includes no less than three times the actual damages suffered, which explicitly covers mental and emotional distress, or statutory damages of $1,000, whichever amount is greater. Additionally, prevailing tenants are entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs, and potentially punitive damages.[8]In cases of housing discrimination, remedies can include recovery of out-of-pocket losses, damages for emotional distress, civil penalties, punitive damages, and attorney's fees.[42]
- Injunctions and Compliance Orders: In situations where landlords violate BMR program rules, particularly by illegally renting out units, courts can issue orders requiring the landlord to comply with the law. This can include mandating the sale of the illegally rented BMR unit to a qualified low-income household, ensuring the unit returns to its intended purpose and benefits those it was designed to serve.[3]
- Rent Reductions: The San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board (Rent Board) has the authority to grant rent reductions if a landlord has substantially decreased housing services without a corresponding reduction in rent. This can serve as a remedy for issues such as unaddressed repairs, maintenance deficiencies, or interference with amenities.[43]
- Eviction Defense: A primary objective of legal representation in landlord-tenant disputes is to prevent wrongful eviction and ensure tenants can remain in their homes. Organizations like the Eviction Defense Collaborative have demonstrated high success

rates (93%) in achieving this crucial outcome through legal intervention.[10]

The user's situation involves a landlord overstepping boundaries against both the City and the renter. This dual nature of the landlord's misconduct opens up multiple potential remedies that can be pursued simultaneously or strategically. The tenant can pursue direct damages for harm suffered (e.g., harassment, wrongful eviction attempts) and simultaneously benefit from the City's enforcement actions against the landlord (e.g., penalties, forced compliance with BMR rules). The legal strategy extends beyond merely addressing the tenant's direct harm to encompass the landlord's broader non-compliance with public policy. A skilled attorney will not only seek direct compensation for the tenant but also strategically use the landlord's BMR violations and the City's enforcement powers to pressure the landlord into compliance or a favorable settlement. This comprehensive approach can lead to a more robust outcome, potentially ensuring the tenant's long-term housing stability in the BMR unit and holding the landlord accountable on multiple fronts.

VI. Conclusion: Protecting Your BMR Home

Empowering Tenants Through Specialized Legal Representation

Navigating the complexities of Below Market Rate (BMR) housing in San Francisco, especially when facing landlord overreach, demands a highly specialized legal approach. It is critically important for BMR lottery winners to seek legal counsel with deep expertise in both general San Francisco landlord-tenant law and the intricate nuances of the BMR housing program. The unique nature of BMR units, including their lottery-based allocation and strict city regulations, necessitates a lawyer who understands the complex interplay between individual tenant rights and broader city enforcement actions.

The BMR program is a fundamental public policy initiative in San Francisco, designed to address the critical need for affordable housing.[1] When a landlord defrauds this system by illegally renting out a BMR unit or otherwise violates its terms, they are not merely harming an individual tenant but are actively undermining a crucial public good. By pursuing their case with expert legal representation, a BMR tenant is not only protecting their individual right to affordable housing but also contributing to the integrity and enforcement of affordable housing programs across San Francisco. Their legal action helps ensure that BMR units remain available for those who genuinely qualify and need them. This perspective reframes the tenant's struggle as part of a larger, significant effort to ensure housing equity and uphold public policy in San Francisco, which can be empowering for the tenant and highlights the societal value and impact of their legal action beyond their personal circumstances.

Summary of Immediate Next Steps

For a BMR lottery winner experiencing landlord overreach, taking immediate and informed action is paramount to protecting their housing. The following steps are recommended:

- Prioritize a Legal Consultation: Immediately contact a dedicated tenant rights law firm or a non-profit legal aid organization specializing in San Francisco housing law. Seek a free initial consultation to discuss your specific situation and understand your legal standing. This early intervention can be crucial.
- Gather All Documentation: Compile all relevant paperwork related to your BMR unit. This includes proof of your lottery win, your lease agreement, any notices received from your landlord (e.g., eviction notices, rent increase notices), and all written communications with your landlord, property manager, or any relevant city agencies. The more comprehensive your documentation, the stronger your position.
- Detail Landlord Overreach: Prepare a clear, chronological account of your landlord's actions that you believe constitute "overstepping boundaries." Be specific about how these actions affect you personally (e.g., harassment, wrongful eviction attempts) and how they may violate City regulations (e.g., illegal rental of a BMR unit).
- Consider City Reporting (with Counsel): In consultation with your chosen attorney, discuss the strategic implications of reporting BMR program violations directly to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) or the San Francisco City Attorney's Code Enforcement Hotline. This can be a powerful parallel avenue for enforcement, potentially strengthening your case and accelerating a resolution.

—-

Hope this is helpful, and any guidance or next steps from the city would be truly appreciated. I feel like Quincy has brazenly tossed the ball in the City’s court for reasons I cannot comprehend, but personally knowing Ashley from Sentral team and her reputation within my previous residence (let alone Sentral as a whole), I can’t say I’m super shocked—perhaps just about the fact that she decided to pick a fight against the city and relevant agencies.

I also think it’s important to highlight that Puneet violated Attorney-Client Privilege by providing details about the case that she engaged with OTIS PROPERTY OWNER, LLC (Sentral was never the client nor plaintiff—just an agent; examples include including court case number that has been sealed and disputed successfully). Please push me on this, but I will make an official complaint to the BAR association to drive necessary action. However, it is my understanding that I should let the city take it from here while I search for a private counsel (thank goodness for my legal insurance) that can best work with the city attorney. @Mahanaz and @Kyra—what are your thoughts?

Thank you everyone for your time and attention during this unprecedented times. I'm more than determined to get through this, but it does bring back deep psychological trauma I experienced at Chorus, putting me in a tough position given how rarely lottery can be won.

Thanks,

Han Lee
han.lee.personal@gmail.com | +1 415.852.0492

24/7 Supported by martin@trymartin.com | +1 318.513.3389 | email cc, text, or call

On Wed, Jul 23, 2025 at 2:58 PM, Han Lee <han.lee.personal@gmail.com> wrote:

> + Speaker Pelosi and SF office COS for help
>
> **Han Lee**
> han.lee.personal@gmail.com | +1 415.852.0492
>
> 24/7 Supported by martin@trymartin.com | +1 318.513.3389 | email cc, text, or call
>
> On Wed, Jul 23, 2025 at 2:50 PM, Han Lee <han.lee.personal@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> > + Mahanaz + DA's office + mayor + Supervisors
> >
> > + MetLife—please urgently assign a counsel
> >
> > **Han Lee**
> > han.lee.personal@gmail.com | +1 415.852.0492
> >
> > 24/7 Supported by martin@trymartin.com | +1 318.513.3389 | email cc, text, or call

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: Post from Lee"s Perspective (@Dogrunner47)
Date:	Friday, August 1, 2025 10:48:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Lee Heidhues regarding grocery store hiring practices.

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: Lee Heidhues <leerossh@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 26, 2025 1:38 PM
To: Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Post from Lee's Perspective (@Dogrunner47)

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

Lee's Perspective (@Dogrunner47) posted at 1:28 PM on Sat, Jul 26, 2025:
@Safeway part of supermarket giant @Albertsons is looking to hire #scabs. In the corporate vernacular these workers are called 'Temporary Grocery Worker'. I spoke with a clerk at #Andronicos a Safeway affiliate. He told me management is only offering a $.60 hourly wage increase. https://t.co/7RsSSlzZX8 (https://x.com/Dogrunner47/status/1949205284913811641?t=kJcxYvke-lN8YwILFkGZQA&s=03)

In Solidarity,
Lee Heidhues
Www.leesperspective.com

Item 44

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: Changing public hearing process
Date:	Friday, August 1, 2025 10:49:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Randy Shaw regarding public comment.

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: Randy Shaw <randy@thclinic.org>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 10:45 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Changing public hearing process

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

Dear Supervisor,

I hope you will consider this recommended easy change to public testimony at hearings. It will increase public input and enhance democracy. Thanks, https://beyondchron.org/how-san-francisco-discourages-public-engagement/

Randy Shaw
Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Editor, https://beyondchron.org/
Buy my updated new book and support the Tenderloin Museum,
https://www.tenderloinmuseum.org/buy-the-book

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This document is intended for the use of the party to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and protected from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee, or a person authorized to accept documents on behalf of the addressee, you are hereby notified that any review, disclosure, dissemination, copying, or other action based on the content of this communication is not authorized. If you have received this document in error, please immediately reply to the sender and delete or shred all copies.

Item 45

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: San Francisco Centre or Trump"s garden
Date:	Friday, August 1, 2025 11:09:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Allen Jones regarding a proposed American heroes garden.

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: Allen Jones <jones-allen@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2025 12:39 PM
To: MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Li, Roland <Roland.Li@sfchronicle.com>
Subject: San Francisco Centre or Trump's garden

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

Attention All Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I hope you all enjoy your August break, but I want to direct your attention to my Opinion piece that was just published in the San Francisco Bay Area Reporter.

You should know that the auction on the San Francisco Centre has been postponed for the 6th time.

According to a reporter from the San Francisco Chronicle, the new date is August 21, 2025.

I know that there are many plans to help this troubled corridor, but I do not think a great act of heroics in San Francisco history was at all considered as part of the planning.
Guest Opinion: SF can revitalize Market St. with heroes museum
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://share.google/KK2gJc7yhOq0TzDq9___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzplMmVlNzZhYTA0Njc3Y2E1NTQ1YzBiNTUwNTdiNjgwYTo3OjRmYTk6N2NiYTU0YTkzNWM2ZjU2N2RjYTMzNTA2OTE0MDk3MzEyN2E4MjJiYzY3MTAwODMzODI5YWZiYTU5MTdlZGNmZDp0OlQ6Tg

Allen Jones
(415) 756-7733
jones-allen@att.net
Californiaclemency.org

The Only thing I love more than justice is the freedom to fight for it.

Item 46

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: Affordable Housing Architecture
Date:	Friday, August 1, 2025 11:12:00 AM
Attachments:	Screenshot (1036).png Screenshot (1037).png

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Kaden Nguyen regarding affordable housing architecture.

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: Kaden Nguyen <kadennguyen076@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2025 8:00 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Affordable Housing Architecture

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

Dear the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I strongly support the ongoing efforts to increase affordable housing, but at the same time, I am deeply concerned about the aesthetic direction of these developments. Too often, new affordable housing projects adopt a modernist style that appears disconnected from San Francisco's rich historical architectural heritage—particularly its iconic Victorian buildings, many of which have been demolished to make way for visually bland, utilitarian buildings.

Affordable housing does not need to be architecturally bland. History shows that it is possible for it to be beautiful. However, our permitting process makes this difficult. The numerous unnecessary fees from the building permitting process divert funds away from thoughtful design elements like ornamentation and façade details, discouraging developers from pursuing classical styles. While some argue that classical architecture is impractical today due to its craftsmanship demands, this overlooks its history. The Victorians homes of the city were built from the 1850-90s, right during the Industrial Revolution. During this period,

some decorations and ornaments, such as columns and wall-moldings were mass-produced in factories. Mass-production allowed the construction of these buildings to be fast, efficient, and affordable. Some were even kit homes, which were assembled on site with factory-made parts. While it is true that some homes had their details handmade, this was only mostly true for the large mansions, since the wealthy could afford superior craftsmanship over the middle class. The mass production allowed the middle class to afford more designs to decorate their homes. Moreover, carpenters did not work alone, they sometimes had machines and mechanical tools that helped them create and replicate designs. Since the manufacturing and design technologies are much more advanced than they were in the 1800s, the construction of beautiful classically-designed buildings is actually faster than it was in the 1800s.

San Francisco's remaining Victorians now sell for millions, driven in part by their timeless architecture. A study in the Netherlands confirms that homes with classical design command higher prices than their modern counterparts. This is because classically-designed buildings are harder to find than modern ones, and classically designed buildings are seen as more attractive by the public. The scarcity of classically-designed buildings isn't unavoidable—it's simply driven by restrictive regulations by city governments. When looser zoning laws allowed for the greater construction of classically designed buildings, the study found that prices dropped and stabilized. Similarly, relaxing design-related codes today could help make beauty more attainable and bring affordability to historic neighborhoods.

The study link-https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1540-6229.12137

There have been examples throughout history where affordable housing can be beautiful. Vienna's post–WWI "Gemeindebau" provided beautiful and affordable housing complexes that were complete with courtyards and prioritized access for seniors and people with disabilities. Another example is the U.S. Housing Corporation. The U.S. Housing Corporation was a government agency created during WW1 to combat the housing crisis in communities, due to a rapid influx of industrial workers for the war effort. The agency oversaw the construction of 80 new communities in just 2 years. These communities were thoughtfully designed complete with parks, shops, and schools and the homes were designed to be aesthetically pleasing. While most of the homes built by the government were single-family, instead of the apartment complexes that we so desperately need today, this proves that affordable housing can be beautiful. The Mare Island neighborhood in Vallejo is one of the developments that still stand today.

Classical buildings also lend themselves to adaptive reuse, making them sustainable and having longer lifespans. Modernist buildings, on the other hand, are often demolished due to public dislike, wasting materials and environmental resources.

Many new developments often clash with their surrounding built environment, fueling NIMBYism and hindering acceptance. While it is true that buildings that attract criticism at first can become beloved landmarks in the future, such as the Trans-America Pyramid, it is because these buildings are unique and charming in their own way. The new apartment blocks are simply too bland and uniform. Classical architecture fosters cohesion and strengthens

neighborhood character. Buildings that complement neighborhood architecture can ease NIMBYism.

Pedestrian-friendly design also matters. In neighborhoods like North Beach, human-scaled Victorians encourage walkability and local commerce. They also create an inviting environment. Replacing this with bland and generic modernist buildings would diminish that spirit.

After the 1906 earthquake, San Francisco relaxed building codes up to 50% to commence reconstruction. Many of those classically inspired buildings still stand today. Why is the same urgency not happening today when the city struggles with housing and homelessness? I'm not saying that we should add another layer of strictness by requiring every new building to be classical, or make every new building an architectural masterwork, I'm saying more relaxed building codes would make it more economical and cheaper to build more beautiful buildings, as there are less fees and complex processes with the project. Buildings built in the post-earthquake era still paid homage to the rich Victorian past of the city.



Take a look at the Art-Deco style apartment tower next to the painted ladies on the right from the Google Earth photo. While it is taller and not as detailed as the surrounding homes, it still blends in well with the surrounding environment. It incorporates bay windows into its design, allowing it to fit in with the surrounding homes. This is an example of how buildings can complement the neighborhood's character. I also think that we should be more generous with height limits to allow classically-designed buildings to be taller, since they complement the surrounding area, while adding density to the neighborhood.

One policy deserves reconsideration: the requirement for two staircases in all apartment buildings. While safety is a priority, this regulation limits units on narrow lots and inflates costs. This also reduces the available floor area in apartment buildings. In the 1970s, Seattle allowed single-staircase designs in buildings under six stories. Now, it is one of the few cities where you can find apartment buildings on small lots and many new apartment buildings have been constructed in the growing city. We should pass the same reform here, in San Francisco too. This would allow many new types of housing to be constructed and would be a huge step in streaming the permit process. As for safety, we should focus on fire prevention strategies like using fire-resistant materials, rather than relying solely on evacuation architecture.

To encourage aesthetically thoughtful development, the city should consider offering grants or tax credits to developers who embrace classical styles that respect the built environment.

San Francisco deserves affordable housing that complements its legacy—not buildings that compete with it. While some fear that more affordable housing might disrupt the city's character, this is also an opportunity to beautify and enhance the character of the city. I urge you to consider reforms that incentivize beauty, flexibility, and historical continuity as we shape the future of our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Kaden

Item 47

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); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Street Safety Act
Date:	Friday, August 1, 2025 11:18:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Lisa Platt regarding File No. 250851.

> **File No. 250851:** Resolution urging a preventative, interagency, and data-driven approach to ending severe and fatal traffic crashes by designing and enforcing safer streets for all San Franciscans, with a particular focus on protecting children, seniors, and other vulnerable populations. (Melgar, Dorsey, Mahmood, Sauter)

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 Platt <plattauensen@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2025 3:21 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@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>
Subject: Street Safety Act

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

Hello, I'm Lisa – a D2 resident – though I have been doing volunteer trash cleanups and transit funding awareness across the city, so I've had a chance to walk every neighborhood and interact with residents and merchants broadly.

I'd like to thank Supervisor Melgar for introducing the resolution for the Street Safety Act to protect San Franciscans from traffic violence, and I encourage the full Board to support it. I also appreciate the daylighting efforts currently underway in D5.

In 2014, riding my bike home from work along the Embarcadero, I had my cheek smashed, hand and ribs broken, and blood dripping down my face from a split above my eye. I regained consciousness surrounded by tourists who were trying to help. I never fully regained feeling in my face and have reduced mobility in my hand. Luckily, the bike lane has since been partially protected, but there are still lots of streets that are dangerous or even lethal to people like me – just trying to get home from work or run to the grocery store.

Unfortunately, with 10 of your constituents dying in traffic incidents just this year – 4 more than when I appeared before the board in support of renewing Vision Zero just two months ago – and with many more experiencing lasting injuries, like myself, the Board is sadly giving this crucial issue the same level of importance as designating July 22 as Lady Gaga Day, which you passed a resolution on in your last full meeting.

My ask today is to put real action behind this. While a resolution is *something*, it is also non-binding and thus holds little weight. Pass ordinances, not resolutions. Follow up on your commitment to city-wide no-turn-on-red (as was passed in a previous resolution), press SFMTA to implement street safety projects like Valencia bike lanes as they were originally spec'd and insist on hardened daylighting – as a start. I 311'd three Amazon trucks parked in daylighting zones on high-injury corridors in just one week. This safety feature has since turned into a convenient place to short-term park while pedestrians continue to be at risk.

Each month that street safety projects get delayed, we seem to lose another senior to a tragic traffic incident. Let the man killed last week in the Excelsior be the last.

Safer bike infrastructure was introduced in 2005 with delays due to environmental review until 2010. The city had 35 bike lane projects ready to implement. The Embarcadero quick build didn't get completed until 2022. Imagine if that had been done before my 2014 crash – 9 years after the introduction of the plan and 4 years after the completion of environmental review. I mostly walk and run these days, but every single day involves a close encounter with a car and now the motorbikes used by delivery drivers.

I've attached a photo of me a bit after my crash, not pictured is the long-term physical

impact for me of unsafe streets.

Sincerely,
Lisa Platt

Item 48

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: Request for Protection of San Francisco Disability Pride Treasures
Date:	Friday, August 1, 2025 11:20:00 AM
Attachments:	Board of Supervisors Treasure Hunt.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Jennifer Walsh regarding the San Francisco Disability Pride Treasure Hunt.

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: Jennifer Walsh <jennifer@sfcommunityliving.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2025 4:00 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Request for Protection of San Francisco Disability Pride Treasures

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

Hello Board of Supervisors,

I'm Jennifer Walsh, the Inclusion and Accessibility Lead at The Community Living Campaign (CLC).

CLC recently concluded the San Francisco Disability Pride Treasure Hunt, which took place from July 8th to July 29th. The event featured four in-person guided treasure hunts, three virtual hunts, and a self-paced hunt, during which participants searched for eighteen treasures. San Francisco is rich in disability pride and cultural heritage, and there are many more treasures dispersed throughout the city that remain undiscovered.

Attached is a letter with more information about the treasure hunt, as well as a request

for you to help protect the San Francisco Disability Pride Treasures. Several participants have signed this letter during our Disability Pride Treasure Hunt celebration on the 30th.

Thank you for taking the time to read the letter I've attached.

Best regards,
Jennifer Walsh

COMMUNITY LIVING CAMPAIGN

Creating Connections to Help Seniors and People with Disabilities Age and Thrive at Home

Board of Directors
Duff Axsom
Roger Coble
Ramona Davies
Dave Knego
Emily Lee
Linda Murley
Robert Newbold
Ranjani Ramakrishna
Keyatta Shade
Valorie Villela
Jarmin Yeh

Board Members Emeritus
Allison Domicone
Kasley Killam

Marie Jobling
Co-Executive Director

Kate Kuckro
Co-Executive Director

Address
1663 Mission Street
Suite 525
San Francisco, CA 94103

Phone
415-821-1003

E-mail
info@sfcommunityliving.org

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The Community Living Campaign has recently concluded the San Francisco Disability Pride Treasure Hunt, which took place from July 8th to July 29th. The event comprised four in-person guided treasure hunts and three virtual ones, during which participants sought out eighteen treasures. San Francisco is immensely rich in disability pride and cultural heritage, and many more treasures, dispersed throughout the city, remain undiscovered.

Most of these treasures depend on some form of government funding. Regrettably, budget cuts have been implemented across various levels, with additional reductions anticipated in the near future. Our treasures are located across different sectors of San Francisco and are supported by federal funding. Our visits included public and private parks, the San Francisco Unified School District, nonprofit organizations that promote disability autonomy and empower individuals with disabilities, as well as the Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS) and City libraries.

We respectfully request that you collaborate with the Mayor and the disability community to safeguard San Francisco's treasures for future generations. Here is a link to the self-paced treasure hunt designed to provide further information about our treasures. https://sfcommunityliving.org/event/dpe25-self-paced/. Some of the participants of the treasure hunt have signed this letter.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Walsh
Inclusion and Accessibility Lead
Community Living Campaign
jennifer@sfcommunityliving.org
(415) 821-1003 ext. 111

Additional signatures attached

Item 49

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: SFMTA Overhead Crossing Policy Change - Impact to Sonic Telecom
Date:	Monday, August 4, 2025 11:46:00 AM
Attachments:	Re SFMTA MUNIOverhead Lines Issues.msg
Importance:	High

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Bill Greenlaw regarding overhead crossings of SFMTA lines.

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: Bill Greenlaw <bill.greenlaw@sonic.com>
Sent: Friday, August 1, 2025 2:30 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@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>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; Stephen P. Bowen <steve.bowen@bowenlawgroup.com>; Tal Strolicht <tal.strolicht@sonic.com>
Subject: SFMTA Overhead Crossing Policy Change - Impact to Sonic Telecom
Importance: High

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

To Whom It May Concern,

I wanted to direct this issue to the District Supervisors collectively in hopes of getting some traction on finding a solution to an issue that Sonic and the SFMTA had previously

already solved.

In short, this issue pertains to the issue of Overhead (OH) crossings of SFMTA train/trolley lines within the city. The SFMTA enacted a policy sometime in the fall of 2024 that is "undoing" a solution that worked well for both parties up until that point in time. I'm attaching the email from September 2022 when this process appeared to be worked out in concept and then subsequently was used until late last year with no issues to facilitate a couple hundred crossings.

This was the result of numerous discussions and collaboration with SFMTA, we were able to work out a process where we could submit clearances to do OH work provided we maintained a 10ft clearance from energized lines using non-conductive tools. The process was beta-tested and approved by both parties and worked fine for the better part of two years with no real issues and enabled Sonic to provide service to a larger footprint within the city. The last OH clearance we successfully permitted and completed was in October 2024. In December 2024, a newer SFMTA contact advised our Sonic team that the OH Lines Department had decided to require all projects to follow a standard procedure when working around live overhead wires and they would be reviewing all work plans prior to commencing work. However, once we moved forward with our next OH permit we were informed that there is now a $10,000 fee per OH clearance.

As you are probably aware, there is legal authority within the PU Code with respect to municipalities charging fees that are reasonable and **cost-based** and that typically extends to transit authorities unless the ROW in question is an exclusive rail corridor. In the case of Sonic's OH crossings the huge majority, if not all of them, are around above ground corridors that also serve as general purpose roads.

We're hopeful that we could find a way to revert back to the solution that worked well from 2022 through 2024 and helped enable us to efficiently serve areas of SF where the dynamic of OH clearances with the MTA lines occurred. If there is a reasonable fee involved with these reviews Sonic is willing to have those discussions but we do not feel $10K is reasonable or reflects the cost to review such work plans that have been vetted with no issue for the 2 years prior. There are also concerns with respect to whether this fee is being applied to all telecom carriers, ISPs and cable companies on a non-discriminatory basis as required in the California PU Code. For now, we are more interested in hopefully finding a common solution, whether it be the solution that had already been developed and implemented in 2022 or something very similar.

We had prior discussions with the District 7 staff (Michael Farrah and Jen Low) and they were going to look into this, but the issue is starting to cost Sonic customers and is also impairing our ability to repair existing customers in a few locations so we would like some advocacy with the SFMTA at the District Supervisor level to try to further assist in getting us back to a workable solution for this issue. Happy to set up time to discuss the issue in more detail as necessary.

Sincerely,

Bill Greenlaw
Director of Regulatory and Governmental Affairs
O: 707 387-1243
E: bill.greenlaw@sonic.com

SONIC.
Fiber-optic Internet

Item 50

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: UN Plaza - Rock
Date:	Monday, August 4, 2025 11:49:00 AM
Attachments:	UN Plaza - Rock Additional Photo.msg

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Linda Brotemarkle regarding UN Plaza.

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 Brotemarkle <quietspy@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 2, 2025 10:27 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: team@daniellurie.com; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: UN Plaza - Rock

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

Honorable Elected Officials:

Why is this huge rock covering part of the Latitude/Longitude inlay in UN Plaza? I can't believe that someone approved that rock in this place.

UN Plaza was dedicated in 1975 to commemorate the City's huge role in the signing of the United Nation's Charter in 1945. **It is part of San Francisco Civic Center Historic District, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.**

If this rock is intended to be a bollard, it's clearly not going to work (see huge gap in the fence on the left and the flimsy fence). Please remove this rock immediately.

Thank you,

Linda Brotemarkle
691 Post St Apt 504 (at this address for 40 years).
415-409-0911

Photos: First = taken a few days ago. Second = from 2013.

Granite latitude and longitude inlays at UN Plaza (2013)

From: Linda Brotemarkle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); SauterStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS)
Subject: UN Plaza - Rock Additional Photo
Date: Sunday, August 3, 2025 2:58:27 PM

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

Honorable Elected Officials:

Here is an additional photo of the stone obscuring the Latitude/Longitude inlay in UN Plaza. I apologize for not sending this with my first email.

Thank you,

Linda Brotemarkle
691 Post St Apt 504 (40 years at this address)
415-409-0911

Sent from my iPhone

Item 51

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)
Subject:	FW: Urgent Plea: The human cost of UCSF"s unchecked expansion
Date:	Thursday, August 7, 2025 8:25:44 AM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Jeanine Alexander regarding construction at University of California, San Francisco (UCSF), Parnassus Campus.

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: Jeanine Alexander <jeaninealexander@earthlink.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 8:00 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Urgent Plea: The human cost of UCSF's unchecked expansion

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

Hi,

I’m reaching out because I’m at the end of my rope and the life-changing impact of UCSF’s ongoing construction campaign at the Parnassus campus in the Inner Sunset of San Francisco is getting zero press and no attention from state and local politicians. For me personally, it's not a NIMBY issue, or about UC deviating from their mission, or breaking their promise not to exceed their footprint. It’s about the fact that their current course of action is causing real harm to their neighbors, staff, students, patients, and visitors. Their pernicious construction plans are having a detrimental effect on the mental and emotional health of those of us who are forced to live with the relentless noise, air pollution, increase in traffic, and economic effects of the multiple projects currently under construction. And, left unchecked, there are more to come. Forgive my poorly worded plea, but my honest intention is to garner attention from our elected officials in the hope that you will hear my words, and take a serious look at the manner in which UCSF continues to operate unchecked. This sure as hell wouldn’t be happening in Pacific Heights or St. Francis Woods.

I have lived close to the top of 4th Ave since 1997. Initially, UCSF was a fairly benign neighbor, but over the last 3 years nothing could be further from the truth, living in their shadow has become a nightmare. Regardless my opinions on UCSF, and these projects, living through construction has been nearly 3 years of cruel torture with years and years yet to come.

- 2023 was a full year of demolition, jack-hammering 6 days a week starting at 7:00 AM, with little effort to contain the dust and debris which included asbestos dust.
- 2024 was a full year of pile driving, again 6 days a week with random night work.
- So far, 2025 has been the worst yet. Come November, it will have been a year of excruciating metal work. Multiple times a month they start at 6:00 AM and continue well into the evenings.
- According to the vet, one of my pets is so stressed by the unrelenting construction noise that she has licked all of the fur off her belly and her skin is as raw as hamburger meat — I have to ask, if it's having this effect on her, what is it doing to the rest of us? I tried seeing a behavioral therapist to try to cope, but there is no therapy for the profound sense of helplessness we are experiencing. My hands often shake, I’m often on the verge of tears. The noise is wearing away my patience and has eroded my emotional cushion. I’ve lost my sense of home and safety, and feel a loss of control over my own environment. I can’t use my yard, can’t open the windows, which are constantly filthy, I have to routinely hose down the plants in the back -- as the new research building looms larger and larger overhead. What is the constant vibration doing to the foundation of my 1910 home? Many of us have ignored actual earthquakes, assuming that the shaking was coming from up the hill. And, even if I wanted to sell and move somewhere quieter, who would want to buy a house that may as well be in a war zone.
- UCSF’s response borders on disdain, and a total lack of concern for the well-being of their neighbors, their own staff, their patients, and visitors. The message is clear, they are moving forward despite anything we say, they consider themselves a law unto themselves and, as the state, insist that they are not subject to local noise and construction ordinances. Anyone I have contacted locally insists that there is nothing they can do, after all, it’s the state. Meanwhile, they are knowingly doing real harm. Decibel levels are consistently over 80 - 90 and often peak over 100. Those recordings are from my home as they do not release their own recordings.
- Total strangers instantly offer their condolences when they find out where I live. I can only imagine what it's like to have to work in the buildings adjacent to either project or to come here for care. I

have a neighbor who goes into her closet to take work calls. The noise is inescapable. It can be heard in Cole Valley, down on Irving Street. This week, the noise has been a combination of metal sawing, a dental drill-like noise, back up beeping for at least 8 vehicles, laced with hammering and shouting, against the background of a never-ending generator-like noise. Layer on the massive increase in traffic up and down 4th Ave, construction vehicles staging in the middle of public streets, a constant flow of delivery trucks, a fleet of new shuttles, heavy equipment arriving in the middle of the night, etc. There is no peace, no reprieve, no end in sight.

The two current projects won't be completed until 2027, if they continue on schedule. Left unchecked, other approved projects in the pipeline will not conclude until 2050. I will be dead by then. It is extremely difficult and unhealthy, living with a constant feeling of powerlessness and desperation, feeling ignored by local politicians and state government officials while UCSF continues to act with impunity. There are days it's all I can do not to run yelling up the hill, "please stop, stop, you've got to stop, this can't go on."

I would be happy to discuss this further.

The next construction update meeting is scheduled for August 13 at 6:00 PM, in-person or via Zoom.

Kindly meant,

Jeanine Alexander
1376 4th Ave. SF
415-793-8349

Item 52

From:	Chris K.
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); kory.powell-mccoy@mail.house.gov; Krista.Pfefferkorn@sen.ca.gov
Subject:	Board of Supervisors Meeting Public Comment
Date:	Monday, August 11, 2025 12:43:32 PM
Attachments:	Complaint Submitted - Internet Crime Complaint Center (IC3).pdf

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please provide a copy of this to each Board of Supervisors and I will discuss it at the next Board meeting in September.

Respectfully,

Chris Ward Kline
E-5/Sgt
USMC
Active Duty

Your IC3 Complaint

Submission ID:	4b90e3d4c3944481b408adae860a89c4
Date Filed:	8/10/2025 5:36:12 PM EST
Were you the one affected in this incident?	Yes

Your Contact Information

Name:	CHRIS WARD KLINE
Business Name:	PAVEN
Phone Number:	4155139334
Email Address:	CKBLUEAQUA@GMAIL.COM

Complainant Information

Name:	CHRIS WARD KLINE
Address:	250 KEARNY STREET
Suite/Apt./Mail Stop:	618
City:	SAN FRANCISCO
County:	SAN FRANCISCO
Country:	United States of America
State:	California
Zip Code/Route:	94108
Phone Number:	4155139334

Email Address:	CKBLUEAQUA@GMAIL.COM

Business Information

Is this on behalf of a business that was targeted by a Cyber incident?	Yes
Business Name:	PAVEN
Is the incident currently impacting business operations?	Yes
If your business or organization is defined as a critical infrastructure entity, select the sector below:	Energy
If known or applicable, please select the critical infrastructure subsector:	Electricity

Financial Transaction(s)

Did you send or lose money in the incident?	No

Information About The Subject(s)

Name:	DANIEL LURIE
Business Name:	MAYOR OF SF

- - - -

Name:	MATTHEW JOHNS

Business Name: HHS REG. ADMIN

Name: RAM KOPPAKA

Business Name: CDC ASS. DIR

Description of Incident

Provide a description of the incident and how you (or those you are filling this out on behalf of) were victimized. Provide information not captured elsewhere in this complaint form:

At 0945 hrs on August 9, 2025, I, Chris Ward Kline, assigned to the Marine Corps Task Force, volunteered (and work with the Marine Corps to provide safety and security) to work the Pistahan Festival and Parade, arrived at the starting point of the Parade. Shortly thereafter, I observed the surveillance equipment on top of the Main Library and Asian Art Museum turned on with the scanner inside the equipment turned on. I immediately took photos of the equipment and have the photos stored on my phone and sent them to the Sheriff and Police Chief. On one of the photos, ultrasound waves could be seen coming from above to the boxes suggesting that communication was being fed with aircraft and/or satellites - it is unknown but probably that communication was two-way.

The Mayor of San Francisco deployed this technology and should be noted that he was not at the festival nor at the Parade because he was aware of this technology being turned on. Previously, he has partnered with San Francisco State, the company Ripple, the state of Iowa and foreign countries.

For this to not be reported, it has to be covered up within HHS and that points directly to the current Regional Administrator and former Regional Administrator. Matthew Johns and Ram Koppaka both have motive and I, and the Marine Corps can provide

overwhelming evidence directly linking those two to military incidents in which equipment was damaged and personnel were lost. You can contact NCIS for further details.

I also have stored on my phone, over 30 license plates from out of state in which Lurie and others, have revered engineered geo-spatial surveillance to cause violence in other cities, counties and states. They have also targeted my friends, family and colleagues and have consistently tried to cyberstalk, gaslight, intimidate, harm, harass, etc.

Today, August 10, 2025, I attended a seminar hosted by Arevon who is one of the Sponsors for the Festival. It is now known that this company plans on opening a battery factory in Daly City and these few, plan on using this facility and company to provide the energy behind their operations of criminal conduct.

It should be noted that there were various dignitaries to include the Philippine Consulate's Office, Mayor of Pinole, Supervisor Dorsey, Supervisor Chen, the Sheriff and Police Chief. They were all victimized by the suspects.

Other Information

If an email was used in this incident, please provide a copy of the entire email including full email headers.

I have the photos stored on my device. I hereby give the DOJ and FBI permission to use my credentials, passwords and devices to download all pertinent information, evidence.

Are there any other witnesses or persons affected by this incident?

Speaker Emerita Nancy Pelosi should have been briefed on this incident by officials.

Is this an update to a previously filed complaint?	No

Privacy & Signature:

The collection of information on this form is authorized by one or more of the following statutes: 18 U.S.C. § 1028 (false documents and identity theft); 1028A (aggravated identity theft); 18 U.S.C. § 1029 (credit card fraud); 18 U.S.C. § 1030 (computer fraud); 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud); 18 U.S.C 2318B (counterfeit and illicit labels); 18 U.S.C. § 2319 (violation of intellectual property rights); 28 U.S.C. § 533 (FBI authorized to investigate violations of federal law for which it has primary investigative jurisdiction); and 28 U.S.C. § 534 (FBI authorized to collect and maintain identification, criminal information, crime, and other records).

The collection of this information is relevant and necessary to document and investigate complaints of Internet-related crime. Submission of the information requested is voluntary; however, your failure to supply requested information may impede or preclude the investigation of your complaint by law enforcement agencies.

The information collected is maintained in one or more of the following Privacy Act Systems of Records: the FBI Central Records System, Justice/FBI-002, notice of which was published in the Federal Register at 63 Fed. Reg. 8671 (Feb. 20, 1998); the FBI Data Warehouse System, DOJ/FBI-022, notice of which was published in the Federal Register at 77 Fed. Reg. 40631 (July 10, 2012). Descriptions of these systems may also be found at www.justice.gov/opcl/doj-systems-records#FBI. The information collected may be disclosed in accordance with the routine uses referenced in those notices or as otherwise permitted by law. For example, in accordance with those routine uses, in certain circumstances, the FBI may disclose information from your complaint to appropriate criminal, civil, or regulatory law

enforcement authorities (whether federal, state, local, territorial, tribal, foreign, or international). Information also may be disclosed as a routine use to an organization or individual in both the public or private sector if deemed necessary to elicit information or cooperation from the recipient for use by the FBI in the performance of an authorized activity. "An example would be where the activities of an individual are disclosed to a member of the public in order to elicit his/her assistance in [FBI's] apprehension or detection efforts." 63 Fed. Reg. 8671, 8682 (February 20, 1998).

By typing my name below, I understand and agree that this form of electronic signature has the same legal force and effect as a manual signature. I affirm that the information I provided is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I understand that providing false information could make me subject to fine, imprisonment, or both. (Title 18, U.S.Code, Section 1001)

Digital Signature: CHRIS WARD KLINE

Item 53

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: Immaturity In Uniform: Who"s Policing the Police?
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:53:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from a member of the public regarding the San Francisco Police Department.

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: jtorres1950 <jtorres1950@proton.me>
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2025 10:53 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; ask-uesf@uesf.org; sflink@sfusd.edu
Cc: rswan@sfchronicle.com; eleni@missionlocal.com; tchien@sfstandard.com; jonah@sfstandard.com; abigail@missionlocal.com; jtucker@sfchronicle.com
Subject: Re: Immaturity In Uniform: Who's Policing the Police?

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

Everyone:

Jill's piece on the SFUSD payroll mess revealed the fix to me: pay the children in uniform we call police more so they can lecture adults on safety and teach us to do as they say but not as they do, settle disputes with force and settle out of court so police legally get out of admitting fault, and claim authority over everything while possessing little more than a few minutes of government training. Their divorces and expanding waistlines apparently make them ideal role models. They keep taking from us and we fear doing anything about it.

Why invest in future civilians (what police call us to separate us while they look down on us from their pedestal)--teachers, aides, our children--when we can reward self-serving public servants who value power and cool toys (and they are toys to these grown children)--Tasers, guns, boa hooks, tanks, shields, all things tactical--over long-term public good. Can't really take care of our

educators and school staff, who take care of the next generation to grow up and have good lives and build safe and smart cities, because that would conflict with creating a better society and ridding ourselves of society-killing police and firefighters.

Let's show the world we care more about one group (police and the equally pariah-like, city destroying firefighters) over another (educators and support staff) and throw our money where we are used to putting it: custom trash cans because we are just too good for off the shelf.

Let's hear the city representatives tell us a few more times they care. They might actually believe themselves.

Sent with Proton Mail secure email.

On Friday, August 8th, 2025 at 10:20 PM, jtorres1950 <jtorres1950@proton.me> wrote:

> Everyone,
>
> We are the ones who must hold the police (and fire) accountable. Why are we afraid to challenge a group so clearly detached from their mission to serve and protect? Slapping that slogan on a squad car doesn't make it true. You cannot serve and protect a city when you are draining it of its resources. Fire fighters don't deserve their pay. Neither do police. Why do we allow them to laugh their way to the bank? https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://www.sfchronicle.com/opinion/letterstotheeditor/article/overtime-firefighter-san-francisco-20807837.php___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiZWIwOWUyMjQ4YzJiNWFhYzE5ZDNhOTViYWJkYzhjMDo3OmQwZGE6YjEwNDA0ZjE0Yzc5OTk5YTdkNWIwYjhlYmNlMTBhMjlhODMxMzJmYjRhOGU1MWUwMWI4MDA1NjY5MzFkMDIzZjp0OlQ6Tg
>
> Time and again, we hear police claim bravery—that they risk their lives for us. Even with public backlash, time and again, we respond with raises and praises. And yet, time and again, we hear they're holding back, unwilling to risk those same lives. The cycle repeats, and we do nothing. https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/San-Francisco-police-only-watch-as-burglary-16647876.php___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiZWIwOWUyMjQ4YzJiNWFhYzE5ZDNhOTViYWJkYzhjMDo3OjFhOGM6Nzg3ZTQzNWM0NmY0NzM0NGViMmI2YWEwMTZlMDViYjI5YmZlMTc0MjZhNjliMjVhMjA4M2IyM2NjODM5MzBmYTp0OlQ6Tg
>
> Many police officers exhibit insubordination, reject scientific guidance, and operate under a misguided sense of righteousness—contributing to preventable tragedies like COVID-related deaths. Critical thinking isn't a skill we can reliably teach after hiring; it must be a baseline requirement. That's why we need to elevate our recruitment standards. A critical thinker can be trained to use a firearm responsibly. But someone who seeks heroism through a badge misunderstands the nature of true heroism—it arises from character and circumstance, not from a job title. We are trusting individuals who lack critical thinking with their decisions. https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://www.sfexaminer.com/archives/covid-is-a-cop-killer-why-are-california-police-officers-rejecting-vaccines/article_373f90f7-d4b9-5a25-8426-

b3776bbc042e.html___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiZWIwOWUyMjQ4YzJiNWFhYzE5ZDNhOTViYWJkYzhjMDo3OjJlZWE6M2M4ZjA3NGQ3OTgzZWIyZTlkMzg5YzU1YjFkN2QzZWVkMTFkZDQ5NjUyMDAxN2NjNDUzN2FkYzFkZDdkMWU5ODp0OlQ6Tg

While driving down Sunset Boulevard in San Francisco during rush hour, I saw two officers double-parked as they addressed a transient sleeping on a patch of grass. At some point during the interaction, they found something amusing enough to laugh—never mind that their cruiser was blocking an entire lane of traffic. Apparently, disrupting the flow of Sunset Boulevard is just part of the job. These seemingly minor incidents may appear trivial, but they reflect a deeper indifference toward the community they're meant to serve. There was no reason to laugh. And certainly no justification for obstructing traffic when two side streets were easily accessible.

Many police officers display immaturity and a lack of professionalism, often expressing contempt through offensive gestures. Their reward? We promote them. https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://missionlocal.org/2024/10/sf-police-union-head-flips-off-activist/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiZWIwOWUyMjQ4YzJiNWFhYzE5ZDNhOTViYWJkYzhjMDo3OmQ3ZTU6OWFlOTY3YTc4ZGUzNWQ0ZTAwMGQ2ZTIzNGNlNDdlOGIwMDMwNDQzYmFiNWIwZDdhMmVmM2E2YzE3OTc1MGZmOTp0OlQ6Tg

While we also learned that are sharing racist or sexually inappropriate memes, others in the department had known and did nothing to stop these childish behaviors. These behaviors reflect a troubling culture enabled by low accountability and minimal standards. It's time to demand more from those entrusted with public safety. https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://missionlocal.org/2025/07/anonymous-___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiZWIwOWUyMjQ4YzJiNWFhYzE5ZDNhOTViYWJkYzhjMDo3OmI2MTM6NjkwMDg4N2FkYTJkODI3ZjQyZGNlOTk3YTg3ZGVmMDhkNzUzZTA4MDQxYTlhMWIzYjRlNWQ0NGFlMzBlNzU4NTp0OlQ6Tgsfpd-instagram-salacious-department-rumors/ https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://sfstandard.com/2025/07/24/cops-are-sending-vicious-memes-their-union-wants-to-stamp-it-out/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiZWIwOWUyMjQ4YzJiNWFhYzE5ZDNhOTViYWJkYzhjMDo3OjNkMzA6NWQ2MjY4NGJhYzk2MGJkNmNiNTY3ZWQ5OWRkZmQyZTk5NDI0MTg1ZGU2MTY3NmJlMDg4MjJhZDUyZTczMjAzNTp0OlQ6Tg

The newly elected union president is already pushing for another raise—an ask that underscores just how out of touch he is with the realities most people face. And yet, these are the individuals we entrust with our safety. The disconnect is alarming. https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://missionlocal.org/2025/07/s-f-police-union-new-president-higher-pay/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiZWIwOWUyMjQ4YzJiNWFhYzE5ZDNhOTViYWJkYzhjMDo3OjE0Y2M6MWY3NjUwOWE4NDVlY2VkNWU2ZTZjNjU1OTRjNDExYjI3ZTY1OTM1MWJkYzBmNDMxYTgxOGRjNGEzMDliNDIwODp0OlQ6Tg

Salary isn't the issue—we have no shortage of applicants willing to work at the base pay. The real problem lies in whom we're selecting. We continue to recruit individuals who are ill-suited for public service, and that mismatch is undermining the integrity of the role. https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiZWIwOWUyMjQ4YzJiNWFhYzE5ZDNhOTViYWJkYzhjMDo3OmVkYmQ6M2YxOWE4MWY1Yzg4ZDA5ZTI4NzNiY2NhNzUzMDY0MmFmMzAwMjdkYzQzYjI5ZWFjOThjNzQzZTBkOTc3MDY5Mjp0OlQ6Tg

What exacerbates the problems in policing is the refusal to admit fault, relying instead on legal settlements to avoid accountability. The financial burden goes far beyond inflated salaries—it's the costly consequences of poor decisions that drain public resources.
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://missionlocal.org/2023/06/millions-law-enforcement-sfpd-sheriff-lawsuit-settlements/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiZWIwOWUyMjQ4YzJiNWFhYzE5ZDNhOTViYWJkYzhjMDo3OmNhMWI6NzJkNGVhOTc3ZTA5NTg5ZGYyYjc1ODczNDY2YjBlMmM0NTY1YzNjYTdlNGFhZjdhOTYyZDg1Y2VhMzIxY2M5Nzp0OlQ6Tg

There are countless stories of everyday citizens stepping in to save police officers—despite having no formal training, no weapons, and no promise of overtime pay. These individuals risk their lives purely out of courage and conviction, a stark contrast to the institutional support officers receive.
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://www.ktvu.com/news/citizens-intervene-in-scuffle-between-san-francisco-officer-homeless-man___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiZWIwOWUyMjQ4YzJiNWFhYzE5ZDNhOTViYWJkYzhjMDo3OjJjZGU6OWM4ZWY5ZDMzN2VhNzU2ZjVjZjE4YmE4ZGNkZTU2ZmNmYzk2NDI3ZTc1NmMzZTExZTJlMzRlOWQ4MDdmNTliNzp0OlQ6Tg

Let’s not overlook the crimes committed not just by individual officers, but by entire police departments. Even when the facts are clear, those in power consistently fail to stand with the public—choosing instead to protect the greed and incompetence of a few at the expense of the many.
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://journalistsresource.org/criminal-justice/uc-berkeley-journalism-program-exposed-police-misconduct-clean-record-agreements/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiZWIwOWUyMjQ4YzJiNWFhYzE5ZDNhOTViYWJkYzhjMDo3OjBmNGQ6MWEyNjUyOTNhNmM1NDNlNzEwNDI2MDJjNWMxOGZhNTUwZDljYzFkN2MwODFiNGJlMDJiODI0ZTljYTBhZGFkMjp0OlQ6Tg

Police are lobbying for lower retirement ages, arguing they deserve it—just like their firefighting peers. But why not extend that same consideration to teachers, librarians, or janitors? Unlike many public servants, officers often retire early only to continue working in law enforcement or move on to other jobs, all while collecting some of the highest pensions in government service.

And yet, we’ve seen cases where someone passes the background checks, completes training, and still ends up causing harm—injuring entire families. The system isn’t just flawed in theory; it’s failing in practice.
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://abc7news.com/post/sunset-district-car-crash-new-sfpd-officer-ryan-___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiZWIwOWUyMjQ4YzJiNWFhYzE5ZDNhOTViYWJkYzhjMDo3OmQzMWI6YmFmZDM2YzgyNjc2YWMxYTBmOGY1ODE2ZDM4ZWNmNTgzMjYyNDdmMzNlM2Q5ZjhhYjJlNzU5YjkwZTRmYjY2YTp0OlQ6Tgkwong-arrested-dui-following-collision-injuring-4-others-authorities-confirm/16450245/

Policing in America has increasingly become a source of harm rather than protection. While law enforcement is meant to uphold safety and justice, numerous studies and historical patterns reveal a troubling reality: police actions often inflict deep social, psychological, and economic damage on the very communities they’re meant to serve. Police serve a purpose, but they are taking more than they give back. We call them heroes, and they prove to be disappointments.

By refusing to act—or by continually yielding to every police demand—we are failing one another. It’s a damning reflection of our priorities: pouring resources into a small group of petulant, self-serving officers instead of investing in the foundations that would allow the next generation to thrive in this city. It's incredible we sit idly by and allow one group to take so much from our society while we struggle with keeping schools open and teachers employed.

The most disheartening truth? Even when faced with the facts, most of you will still choose inaction. And that, more than anything, is what stings. I'll stay glued to the news to watch another press conference with politicians and the police patting themselves on the back with background noise of schools closing and streets going uncleaned. We truly are a stupid group of people.

Sent with Proton Mail secure email.

Item 54

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)
Subject:	No Turn on Red File No. 231016 2 letters
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 12:43:46 PM
Attachments:	2 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 letters, from members of the public, regarding:

> File No. 231016, Resolution No 481-23 - Resolution urging the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) to develop and implement a plan for No Turn On Red (NTOR) at every signalized intersection in San Francisco and approve a citywide NTOR policy.

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:	Jym Dyer
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, August 4, 2025 12:45:00 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 support and approve a citywide No Turn On Red to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco as well as make streets safer and more predictable for car drivers. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco (e.g. the 50 intersections in the Tenderloin). Now is the time to expand No Turn On Red citywide, so drivers know this unsafe behavior is no longer permitted throughout the city while people can feel safe crossing the street with easier and greater access.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to shift trips from cars to public transportation and active transportation (e.g. bikes, scooters, skateboards, mobility devices, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will increase roadway safety (decrease roadway injuries) and help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, making our city safer for people, especially people who are disproportionately negatively impacted by our roadway safety crisis and car-dominated transportation system (children, seniors, people living with disabilities, BIPOC). We need your leadership to make this street safety improvement now.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything in your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow SFMTA to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection — which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost and using significantly less staff time — and legislation to implement No Turn On Red statewide.

Thank you,

Jym Dyer
jym+streetsforward@scorcher.org
132 Beulah Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Radhika N
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street...
Date:	Sunday, August 24, 2025 8:36:53 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 support and approve a citywide No Turn On Red to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco as well as make streets safer and more predictable for car drivers. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco (e.g. the 50 intersections in the Tenderloin). Now is the time to expand No Turn On Red citywide, so drivers know this unsafe behavior is no longer permitted throughout the city while people can feel safe crossing the street with easier and greater access.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to shift trips from cars to public transportation and active transportation (e.g. bikes, scooters, skateboards, mobility devices, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will increase roadway safety (decrease roadway injuries) and help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, making our city safer for people, especially people who are disproportionately negatively impacted by our roadway safety crisis and car-dominated transportation system (children, seniors, people living with disabilities, BIPOC). We need your leadership to make this street safety improvement now.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything in your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow SFMTA to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection — which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost and using significantly less staff time — and legislation to implement No Turn On Red statewide.

Thank you,

Radhika N
radhika23594@gmail.com
5235 Diamond Heights Blvd
San Francisco, California 94131

Item 55

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)
Subject:	Golden Gate Park meters File No. 250617 - 2 letters
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 12:48:02 PM
Attachments:	GG Park Meters 2 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 2 letters, from members of the public regarding:

> File No. 250617, Resolution No. 327-25 - 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.

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: Adrienne Krug
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: No parking meters in Golden Gate Park!!!
Date: Saturday, August 2, 2025 4:26:52 PM

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

This crown jewel of SF should remain free to all! Central Park in NYC does not have parking meters and New Yorkers would not stand for it! It is a blight on the natural landscape and an offense to all those who want to enjoy our beautiful refuge in SF! Please don't do this!!!
Adrienne Krug

From:	Sandy
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	paid parking in GG Park
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 10:20:14 PM

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

Dear SF Supervisors:

As you all know residents of the City pay a variety of taxes and fees for services already.
We need equal access to GG Park for all. If people are driving from Dogpatch, or Hunterspoint,
or Chinatown, or wherever... people should not have to pay to access the park.
Many families can't afford to pay for parking. They want to go to Children's Playground, to see the Bison, go to the Arboretum, walk around Blue Heron Lake and go up
Strawberry Hill. They want to take their bikes so their kids can ride somewhere safe, without traffic.
Why should they have to pay to do those outdoor adventures?
John McLaren will roll over in his grave! We need to increase access to parks for our families.
We need to get more kids out in nature and active. Placing paid parking in GG Park is a horrible idea. Please make sure to not allow it to happen.
Sincerely,
Sandy Weil, SF Native

Email tagline:
Reminder..."Activism is my rent for living on the planet" Alice Walker

Item 56

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); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	File No. 250655 - 14 Letters
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:43:06 PM
Attachments:	14 Letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 14 letters regarding:

> **File No. 250655, Ord. No. 122-25** - 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 San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency lSFMTA} 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; ,§1,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.

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: Michael Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco RV Ban proposal legislation
Date: Thursday, July 24, 2025 9:17:51 AM

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

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

Re: San Francisco RV Ban proposal legislation

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The Alliance for a Better District 6 deeply cares and fights for seniors and disabled people; we are deeply disturbed to hear about the current legislation on the RV ban. Approximately half of RV residents are seniors, who have been priced out of the housing market. There is not enough housing in next year's budget to meet the needs of folks on the streets, in shelters, let alone those seniors living in RVs. We believe the issues that RVs bring into urban areas can be addressed by opening up safe parking and RV parks, providing sanitation and solar energy, which is quite inexpensive ($300-$500 per RV), along with the expansion of affordable housing. It's a significant issue that many seniors are facing today.

Approximately **half of RV residents** are indeed seniors, and many have found themselves priced out of the traditional housing market. Here are some key points to consider:

1. **Growing Interest in Senior Housing**: The senior housing sector is seeing increased interest, with occupancy rates returning to pre-pandemic levels. This indicates a demand for more affordable options.
2. **Concerns About Homelessness**: Advocates are worried about a rising number of homeless individuals over **60 years old** as affordable housing options dwindle. Many seniors are struggling to find stable living situations.
3. **RV Living as an Alternative**: For some, living in RVs has become a viable solution. The median age of RV owners is approximately **53 years**, and many use RVs as a means to maintain a semblance of home while managing costs.

As the affordability crisis grows, this will be a growing issue. We are concerned about the approximately 1,200 homeless seniors on the street and in shelters, who medically appear on average 25 years senior to their calendar year, will lose out on shelter beds given to those in RVs. They are especially vulnerable to premature death. We care about the SF seniors who lose housing when their incomes drop in retirement and lose the option of moving into an RV with this policy, because only those RVs parked in SF before the end of May 2025 can be permitted to stay. Homelessness will likely be their only choice. We are concerned that seniors living in

RVs may not secure housing before the deadline and are unable to obtain an extension. We are concerned they will end up on the streets.

For all these reasons, please vote to reject the RV ban.
The Allaince for A Better District 6 membership appreciates your consideration.

Sincerely,

Michael Nulty
Executive Director
Alliance for a Better District 6

Michael Nulty

P.O. Box 420782
San Francisco, CA 94142-0782
(415) 339-8327 - Direct
(415) 339-8779 - Alliance for a Better District 6
http://abd6.cfsites.org/

From:	Central City Democrats
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject:	RV Ban legislation proposal
Date:	Thursday, July 24, 2025 9:23:41 AM

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

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

July 17, 2025

Re: RV Ban

Dear Supervisors,

Central City Democrats membership cares and fight for seniors, we are deeply disturbed by the RV ban. Approximately half of RV residents are seniors, who have been priced out of the housing market. There is not enough housing in next years budget to meet the needs of folks on the streets, in shelters, let alone those seniors living in RVs. We believe the issues that RV's bring into urban areas can be addressed by opening up safe parking and RV parks, providing sanitation and solar, which is quite inexpensive ($300-$500 per RV), along with expansion of affordable housing.

As the affordability crisis grows, this will be a growing issue. We are concerned about the approximately 1,200 homeless seniors on the street and in shelter, who medically appear on average 25 years senior their calendar year, will lose out on shelter beds given to those in RV's. They are especially vulnerable to premature death. We care about the SF seniors who lose housing when their incomes drop in retirement and lose the option of moving into an RV with this policy, because only those RV's parked in SF before end of May 2025 can be permitted to stay. Homelessness will likely be their only choice. We are concerned that the seniors living in RV's will not get housing before the time period has ended and are unable to navigate getting an extension. We are concerned they will end up on the streets.

Thank you for considering this pressing issue, as the implications of this decision will resonate far beyond the present, affecting generations of San Franciscans to come. It is imperative to understand that the choices made today will shape the political landscape of tomorrow, influencing how future initiatives are crafted, debated, and implemented, and ultimately determining the level of trust that citizens place in their government. The importance of standing firm against changes that weaken voter protections cannot be overstated; it is a matter of preserving the democratic ideals that San Francisco stands for and ensuring that the voices of its citizens remain paramount in the governance of their city. The future of civic engagement, the strength of community initiatives, and the very essence of participatory democracy hinge on the decisions made in this moment, highlighting the critical need for vigilance, advocacy, and unwavering commitment to the principles that uphold the rights of all citizens to be heard and respected in the political arena.

Regards,

For all these reasons, please reject the RV ban.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Denise Dorey
Co-President

Central City Democrats
P.O. Box 420846
San Francisco, CA 94142-0846
415-339-VOTE (8683) v/Fax
centralcitydemocrats@yahoo.com
Bringing downtown merchants and residents together since 2006.
http://centralcitydemocrats.blogspot.com/

From: L M
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Permanent Housing for RV Residents!
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 6:07:53 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 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. I'm particularly concerned that Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Melgar seem willing to accept non-specific commitments from the Mayor's office on refuge permits without pushing for more permanent housing offers for RV residents. The end result is likely to be families poised on a knife edge - waiting years for housing opportunities while constantly worried that their home may be towed if they make a single misstep.

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,

L M
forlizaspam@gmail.com
1507 33rd ave
San Francisco , California 94122

From: Amelia Aufuldish
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Permanent Housing for RV Residents!
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 6:09:55 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. I'm particularly concerned that Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Melgar seem willing to accept non-specific commitments from the Mayor's office on refuge permits without pushing for more permanent housing offers for RV residents. The end result is likely to be families poised on a knife edge - waiting years for housing opportunities while constantly worried that their home may be towed if they make a single misstep.

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,

Amelia Aufuldish
ameliaka183@gmail.com
1507 33rd ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Magick Altman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Permanent Housing for RV Residents!
Date: Sunday, August 3, 2025 5:15:12 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear 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. I'm particularly concerned that Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Melgar seem willing to accept non-specific commitments from the Mayor's office on refuge permits without pushing for more permanent housing offers for RV residents. The end result is likely to be families poised on a knife edge - waiting years for housing opportunities while constantly worried that their home may be towed if they make a single misstep.

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,

Magick Altman
magicktarot11@gmail.com
2060 Sutter St. #408
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Jessica Adams
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, August 4, 2025 9:42:05 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.

Jessica
California

From: Susie Kameny
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Permanent Housing for RV Residents!
Date: Monday, August 4, 2025 9:26:50 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 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. I'm particularly concerned that Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Melgar seem willing to accept non-specific commitments from the Mayor's office on refuge permits without pushing for more permanent housing offers for RV residents. The end result is likely to be families poised on a knife edge - waiting years for housing opportunities while constantly worried that their home may be towed if they make a single misstep.

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,

Susie Kameny
heydudethatsmycar@yahoo.com
1421 10th ave #303
San Francisco , California 94122

From: benelieberman@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 6:02:48 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:	Ramona Mayon
To:	Modi, Kunal (MYR); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); HSH Grievances; HRC.Commission; Diebold, Jude (HRC); Badasow, Bridget (HOM); Board of Supervisors (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS)
Subject:	RV Abatement Program: visit #1
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 2:48:36 PM
Attachments:	Screenshot_20250805-121423-858.png Screenshot_20250805-121058.png outlook.office365.com_encryption_display-message.pdf A171913 response 6.2.25.pdf

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 the gypsy woman who was the tenants union representative at the infamous Vehicle Triage Center.

This is going to only you, Mr Modi + City Hall, as a courtesy. I am beyond trying to talk to the brass at HSH. A dumber bunch, I never met. You should check their headquarters for mold spores.

Going forward, I will continue to interact with ONLY whatever new worker shows up at my door. Contrary to the ONE records, I am a calm and polite person. It's in my Southern DNA to maintain self - control at all times.

On Monday, there was an equipment failure so no tape like I normally have, thus this email must be HOW I proceed with documentation of my first post-VTC visit from HSH reps.

A sign in my window says "you are being recorded". Meeting was outside. I record so I can document the fraudulent, and sometimes bizarre, behavior of HSH staff because I am not safe with the agency itself. I fear for my life and my liberty and my property.

The number of mistruths I have been complaining about in the ONE file for wayyyyy over a year is suffice to show that. See attached PDF.

There is an exception in the two-party consent law, in that I am always part of these conversations and that I am collecting evidence of a felony, which is financial abuse of a disabled elder (I am 65 on Sept 1), i.e. withholding of services that has caused mental distress and physical danger.

I attach a screenshot of your workers leaving as proof that I was "reactivated" in the ONE system day before yesterday. You can see HOT on the man's jacket. They arrived at 4.38 pm on Aug 4, 2025. They walked up to my RV calling my name.

First words were "Do you know they are going to start making RVs move every two hours?". I answered "Yes, I know about the new program.". Her next question: "Do you want to get rid of this?" motioning to the RV. I said no firmly.

She (re)assessed me via her cell phone skimming over some questions (I know them by heart after 4 years in the ONE system) and said I was now "reactivated". Begs the question why I was deactivated, considering on 6.10.25 when the new RV abatement program was announced, I wrote City Hall and HSH to comment and I also have tickets and a tow warning to prove I was here in May. I assume that to be "deactivated" is in the (likely) event I am towed, I won't show as an active client and won't be able to get the one (1) free impound yard retrieval. Such hypocrisy. Such hatred.

For the record, the changes I have repeatedly asked for before did NOT take place, except the "been arrested 5 times in 5 years". I just received the new edition of the ONE file. Only thing changed is the jail bird stuff.

When the new HOT worker came to the part about me having mental health issues, I insisted she change it to NO. Was difficult to do. I am disappointed you can't hear it for yourself. The other worker, the man, understood immediately when I explained how President Trump's new executive order targets the mentally ill, so why would I allow your agency to continue to misstate this about me?

The opinion in question - my mental health - can only be stated as a fact, by my psychotherapist whom I see every Thursday at 4 pm, since I began my cancer care at UCSF after Sutter dismissed me from hospice care for not dying in the proscribed time frame. I'd sincerely like to know if it's actually within boundaries of the Constitution for me to have to suddenly stand on the sidewalk and defend my mental health status, as it relates to my housing rights. She repeatedly said, what about depression? anxiety? stress?

Ridiculous. I have been lied to and my property damaged as a result - plus what I feel to be falsely imprisoned in an internment camp for thirty months and 21-days, while said lies happened over and over - yet some stranger with a psuedo badge and an unsecured app on a cell phone can put down an OPINION about my mental health status.

I was then made to defend my desire to stay in my RV. She said she would make a note in my file.

https://www.state.gov/defining-anti-roma-racism

NO. Let me be the one to make the note that this is anti-Roma racism, as described in the government memo above. This is my home of over 13 years. It's a GOOD home. It has kept me alive. I adore it. I will never in a million years agree to part with it. I AM MARRIED TO THIS RV BECAUSE MY DEAD HUSBAND FEELS ALIVE IN HERE.

REASON I'm in (3 different) courts is to ask once and for all, why can't I be allowed to die in peace and comfort in my own HOME? I am an ethnic Traveller and that's one of the subsets of Gypsies per the State Dept memo. I am protected under law from this level of intimidation of occupation. This is my home and I have a right to it under the Fair Housing Act.

If your city mechanisms DO seize it, I will go live in a tent in front of City Hall, endlessly weeping, until my last breath. I will howl from the pain of what you have done to me until people in foreign countries hear me. And that act of grief will call up the vampiric underground to sit shiva. I won't be able to stop it. It will be as if my beloved dies all over again, if this RV is taken from me. I have myself convinced he is just asleep in the next

room. My Christian faith feeds that, but my mental health is balanced on keeping it going.

Take it and I die. An act of Murder.

Soooooooo what I ask, this one last time, in light of the visit Monday, going forward, what I want is based on a legal doctrine called "Stare Decisis" ... "To stand by things decided".

From 4.15.21 I was promised "case plan funding" to get my RV repaired, smogged, and move-in costs to a rural RV park. Playlist attached. Over and over over and over, I was told this. I have just as many emails.

Instead 8.9.22 I was forced by threat of my RV being towed (I was on hospice then and even had to endure your workers telling me I'd have to look into "institutionalized hospice" - it's on a tape). So I "agreed" to go to "safe parking".

Except it wasn't safe at all. Next door to a NPL SuperFund site where digging went on near constantly. The 16 unpermitted diesel generators when I got there. I couldn't keep batteries in my carbon monoxide tester because about 3 in morning the fumes were so bad it went off like clockwork. Those were only for the floodlights and to make it look like we had proper care. No electricity until 2024. You go try and live without electricity and propane to cook and heat. An 81-year-old man died out there on coldest rainiest night if year. Nothing changed. See, it was having no fire suppression system set up that allowed them to demand our propane bottles seized. Replaced it with foul, unsafe food nobody could eat. Even the dog couldn't at times. I have FILM of him turning his nose up at it. It's on the playlist. I was obsessive about documenting that BAD food. I filled blog after blog. Constant invasion of seclusion. Rats. The smell of sewage. Forbidden visitors for THIRTY - ONE months, including three Christmas-times. Violent staff, so much so HUD filed a claim on my behalf, against both HSH and Urban Alchemy as me being a witness made to suffer for reporting an ADA issue with a deaf man and a woman in a wheelchair.

www.bayiewvtc.wordpress.com

It was bloody SCARY. And I am a really sick person. HSH stripped me of every bit of my energy and dignity trying to maintain my property. As is the current strategy. The words y'all use, the sheer gaslighting, "lead with compassion and accountability".

What's wrong with this picture is that I had to be intimidated into "services and shelter" in the first place (8.9.22). Just like the current "strategy ". Why must you force us, instead of offer accommodation? What is WRONG with you people? We are human too. We have an inalienable right to exist.

#GypsyLivesMatter

Go after go, plan after plan, hire after hire. Half - repaired. Started but never finished. Looks like I got $20,000 worth of repairs on paper. My RV was damaged over and over. While I battle cancer. I can't say that enough. Speaks volumes about HSH and their non-profiteers.

Then to add insult to injury, the final case manager Feb 2025 writes in the recent ONE files that I received a DMV voucher. NO. Did not. And I can prove I didn't because I got an email from HSH saying I couldn't have DMV assistance until I signed the "Hold Harmless"

agreement attached that would have let Bayview Hunter's Point Foundation off the hook for the damage they did with the 2023 bait and switch of a real mechanic (though unlicensed) for a crew that left my RV even more damaged. Original RV repair fund was for $100,000. How much was the second one for, the one where a man got paid five figures to leave a broke spark plug in my engine and say it was irreparable?

Towed from VTC to street on 3.3.25.

Got the RV to run 4.15.25.

8.4.25 HOT begins evaluating me (again).

Some "CONTINUUM of care", eh? Yet the agency continues to get funds in the placeholder ability of my data, i.e. the ONE file, which is full of lies about me. But if I lie to HSH, I can lose my "shelter and services" spot in the queue? Be stripped of a "permit" that lets me escape "ticket and tow". Do you people hear how stupid all this sounds in a courtroom?

Sigh.

So sick from this experience. Sick from cancer. Sick from grief. Struck with poverty. Yet I am all the ultra-poors have to say these things to you. Yeah, attached is brief I filed 6.3.25 my reply brief to the appeal court (attached). I spoke Truth to Power and a week later - 6.10.25 - Power roared back with an RV ban and a vehicle registry. Direct quote from King Daniel: if you want to live in your RV, you're going to have to leave San Francisco to do it.

Yes, please. I do very much want that, have always wanted it. Tax payers spent a fortune to help me do that. It just didn't make it to me and my RV, that's all. This new lot of another $13 million ought to do exactly nothing as well. On top of how much spent at VTC ($15 to $18 million)?

*

Advice by this new HOT team was that I should go to a tire shop that sells used tires to replace the too-weak car passenger tires the last unlicensed mechanic hired by ECS, as it "really is dangerous". Yeah, that's what the new people told me yesterday, go buy myself some used truck tires right away because they agreed what your mechanic did was likely to cause a wreck if I drive the RV. He charged for six (6) truck tires at $340 each but put on only four (4) passenger car tires that sell retail for $99 each. Same thing with battery. Put in a cheap battery that won't hold a charge, but the City paid a lot more than that brand goes for. I complained over and over in emails to Cody Eliff and "the team" but was told, "Dave is only the only game in town".

Mmmmmmm, indeed. Hard to find someone to do what he did to 20+ RVs.

Here I sit until I figure out how to get gone by December. I care not if you "help" this happen. The story here is how you DIDN'T. This email is to say I won't be abated. I will leave. Under great duress since my health care is here. But I will go.

Oh yes it runs now, volunteer street mechanics found the broken spark plug left in by Dave. $1000 in parts rebuilding the ignition cured the problem I have been asking HSH for help with

for over four years. Video below. Also shows my location if any of you newer politicians tagged in here have the good sense to come see me. Right thing to do.

*

Please ensure that the mental health button remains on NO.

Please ensure the arrests button remains in NO.

Please REMOVE the answer that I have called Crisis Services more than ten times in past year. I have not ONCE called them. I have it on tape the (re) assessment in April by HOT the guy is heard telling me to my visits to UCSF cancer center are crisis.

I want the Problem Solving track. Not the Slum housing track. I have never altered my plans to return to live a normal RV park lifestyle in this RV which is my homestead.

"Stare Decisis".

*

To end on a positive note, I appreciate that an appeal process is being planned for those who cannot leave by December's deadline. I will be pointing that out to the court, especially the part about how I can prove you've been planning this fancy piece of racism since Nov 2023 (documented) but only just got around to being TOLD to set up an illusion of due process in July 2025. Now, what exactly are the safeguards to the ONE system that you are going to install to prevent the Large Vehicle Task Force from lying on the other "entitled troublemakers", like I have established happened to me? I prove in the attached email back from HSH that y'all got me down as mentally ill, getting arrested all the time, calling crisis places, getting evicted, yelling at HOT workers. And I see that now I am also being denied by other organizations that I never even heard of or talked to.

In my legal opinion, at the end of the day, when all is said and done, HSH is going to be a decapitated agency because of #1) the failure to proactively create an appeals process that actually follows proper line of due process (NOTE: my own from 5.1.24 onwards was ignored entirely) and #2) the proclivity of fraud, malice, and oppression in a manner that can be applied with an astoundingly loose and overbroad discretion, all that is summed up in this one PDF from your own people about what they are WILLING to change in my ONE files.

May I add, (federal) government files that are being accessed as we speak in plans for massive full-scale raids of the "Urban squatters" that will put the ICE version to shame.

That's WHY I tried so hard to get to a rural RV park before this (new) reign of terror kicked off. I know what's coming. I was promised assistance and yet here I sit, in an industrial area, still not able to escape this wretched urban decay. It's only in the rural space where an RV dweller is safe. They have RV parks. I have never stopped trying to get there. This email is more of the same.

It's also the reason my administrative claim of 1.22.25 pre-litigation step includes a demand for 10% of Park and Rec many acres, so that the ultra-poors could have ... well ...you know ... refuge.

The hate for the vehicle dwellers has been allowed to grow and fester in America's most progressive city while in 2024, HSH got $101,000 per "unhoused" person per year. My estimate is HSH paid themselves nearly half-a-million dollars on making me suffer at the VTC ($400 per night) and breaking my RV even more than it ever was out by the beach.

"Stare Decisis" is the only acceptable outcome for my "case plan", (started 4.15.21) since I am being forced to leave San Francisco because of my expression of my ethnicity, a gypsyTraveller, a DNA issue which makes me live on wheels.

San Francisco is no longer just another "Sundown Town"; it's now entered officially into a State of Apartheid. Working on a letter to the UN Human Rights folks in Geneva about how bad this feels, being a gypsy in San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Ramona Mayon

5.16.25 on the move again

5.16.25 on the move again

Mayon v. SF: a widow facing cancer/ put me into human zoo



Mayon v. SF: a widow facing cancer/ put me into human zoo





Mon, Aug 4, 2025 • 3:58 PM

Add a caption…

Details

VID_20250804_153348383.mp4

2.1 MP • 1920 x 1080

On device (3.7 GB)

/storage/9C33-6BBD/Pictures/photos

July 2025 and earlier

Add a location

Secure - Request to Correct Personal Information

WK Wehner, Kyle (HOM) <kyle.wehner@sfgov.org>
5/29/2025 11:02:45 PM

To: ramonamayon@yahoo.com

Reply All

Encrypt: This message is encrypted. Recipients can't remove encryption.

Lies in my ONE file - Google Docs.pdf

Dear Ramona Mayon,

On April 23, 2025, the San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) received your written request to correct personal information about you that you reported to be incorrect or incomplete. A copy of your request is attached for reference. The Department conducted a review of your personal records in response to your request, the results of which are described below.

1. You asked HSH to change your mental health problem status ("Yes") in your Adult Primary CE Assessments dated December 30, 2020; January 21, 2021; November 8, 2023; and September 12, 2024. You reported that the correct response should be "No" in all cases. HSH accepted your request and changed the response from "Yes" to "No" in the relevant assessments.

2. You asked HSH to change your age at the first time of homelessness in your Adult Primary CE Assessment dated November 8, 2023. You reported that the correct response should be "Over age 24." HSH accepted your request and changed the response from "Less than age 14" to "Over age 24" in the relevant assessment.

3. You asked HSH to change the number of times you accessed crisis services in the past year ("1-5 times" and "More than 10 times") in your Adult Primary CE Assessments dated December 30, 2020; and November 8, 2023. You reported that the correct response should be "0/none" in both cases. Please note that the definition of crisis services used in this assessment includes hospital visits. If you still wish to change your responses because you did not access any crisis services, including hospital visits, during the time period for the relevant assessments, let us know and HSH will accept your request.

4. You asked HSH to change the number of times you have been arrested by a police officer in the past 5 years ("5 or more times") in your Adult Primary CE Assessment dated November 8, 2023. You reported that the correct response should be "0/none." HSH accepted your request and changed the response from "1-5" to "0/none" in the relevant assessment.

5. You asked HSH to remove information about Moving On assistance from your records. HSH does not have any information about Moving On assistance in your records. Like all records in the ONE System, your record includes a drop-down listing various types of services, including Moving On Assistance, which may or may not be relevant.

6. You asked HSH to remove information about eviction activities from your records. HSH does not have any information about eviction activities in your records. Like all records in the ONE System, your record includes a drop-down listing various types of services, including services related to eviction activities, which may or may not be relevant.

7. You asked HSH to remove a copy of an invoice dated September 21, 2022, from your records. HSH reviewed a video recording you provided that shows you declining the services described in the invoice. Similarly, the invoice notes that services were not rendered as “Customer couldn’t make schedule Appointment time” [sic]. HSH and its contractors are billed for time and expenses incurred even when services are declined. Accordingly, we are retaining this invoice in your records consistent with our financial recordkeeping practices. In addition, we have added a note to your record confirming that the services described in the invoice were not rendered.

8. You asked HSH to remove an outreach worker's characterization of you as "verbally abusive and confrontational" in note dated June 3, 2022. HSH accepted your request and removed the language from the note.

This completes our response to your request to correct information in your personal records. Thank you for your patience as we conducted a review of your records in response to your request.

Sincerely,
Kyle Wehner

Kyle Wehner (he/him)
Privacy and Data Sharing Officer
San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
Email: kyle.wehner@sfgov.org | Phone: (628) 652-7820

Learn: [dhsh.sfgov.org]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.

Message Encryption by Microsoft Office 365

COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT, DIVISION THREE

RAMONA MAYON

Plaintiff/Appellant

V.

LONDON BREED et al.,

Defendants/Respondents.

Case No. A171913

San Francisco Ct. CGC-24-611907

APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF

The Honorable Judge Richard B. Ulmer

Ramona Mayon (pro se)
1559 Sloat Blvd. Suite B-175
San Francisco, CA 94132
Phone: 415-595-6308
ramonamayon@yahoo.com

Addressing the Appeals Court is the point of all legal endeavors. I will not waste your time. When one becomes a union representative, by a collection of signatures, it involves more than confronting bosses or alleged landlords, reading rules, solving tiffs, and preventing evictions (not to mention keeping three dogs from euthanasia), it also means developing relationships with multiple press people. I told one last night, "I am singularly proud that 23 people signed a petition to FORM a union in the first damn place, considering how we were inside a chain link fence in middle of nowhere without lights (!!!) being guarded by long-term former prisoners who give a s*** what they say or do to us. The story here isn't what I am about to write to serious people in a courthouse; the story is how leaders in America's most progressive city thought it perfectly fine to build an internment camp for vehicle dwellers and the only way out was to give up your RV and move into the Tenderloin." I would entreat this august panel to take seriously what people complained about on those petitions, whatever name you give us, we *unionized.*

The consequence that two dozen ultra-poor folk had to pay was known ahead of time, and they willingly endured it to get the attention of HUD, not to mention standing in front of the facility numerous times, speaking to the press in plain view of our very hostile Urban Alchemy guards, some of us have lost our rooms and been forced to "shelter" or SROs but yes, we did finally manage to close down the

foul site that is a border zone to a NPL SuperFund site, the water that is Parcel F of Hunters Point Shipyard, which the U.S. Navy agreed in Sept 2024 R.O.D. that it will remediate beginning in 2027. The digging and soil disturbance that was done at the Vehicle Triage Center (VTC) throughout the three years of residency to the clients/guests/residents/tenants/inmates for contracts in excess of $2,000,000 makes Flint, Michigan look like a toddlers' birthday party. But I'm not a lawyer, so how am I going to say this legally, while striving to maintain relative calm among the inmates? Enter *San Francisco Admin Code 49A*. It was either form a tenants union or file a motion for a writ of habeas corpus.

This $17,000,000 silo of non-profit money laundering "free services" called a "safe parking" existed for a mere thirty-five RVs out of the 1442 vehicle dwellers in the City & County of San Francisco was made possible by three laws: #1) *California Government Code § 65662* which negated the need to pay any attention to CEQA: "A Low Barrier Navigation Center development is a right by use in areas zoned for mixed use and nonresidential zones permitting multifamily uses". The City certainly broke that rule, as the VTC is located in a heavy industrial zone. #2) *California Civil Code 8698.4* which removed the necessity of any health & safety codes if you can get your local fire department to go along. Also, the people in this so-called "Emergency Housing" can't sue. Now, that's clearly the creation of a second-class of citizens. I think the *Unruh Act* would say different.

To qualify: the definition of an internment camp is where an unpopular group is kept outside the rule of law for an indefinite time. You can see why I contemplated habeas corpus. But there was no way to lay down a record of protest first, so I went with the tenant's union. I don't care what you call us so long as it recognized somewhere, at some point, by judges, that the Respondent ignored ALL the requires of *CCC 8698.4* i.e. electricity, fire suppression, and a kitchen for dependent units, which we were because the Urban Alchemy guards extrajudicially took people's propane bottles so they couldn't use stoves (that bit is in the sign-in paperwork) nor have refrigeration as our RV fridges run on propane, no hot water either. They GUTTED our homes. All that replaced it was foul food trays (another non-profit silo) and a single outdoor microwave. It's a violation of the Geneva Convention in times of war (and yes, I do consider this the War on the Ultra-Poors and thus covered by international treaties) to take the "tools of survival" from the citizens. Needless to say I have a highly confrontational film on my YouTube channel (over a thousand films) of me confronting the Fire Marshall about the taking of the people's propane. All the while NO ELECTRICITY while the RULES in *San Francisco Building Code Appendix P* say they must. The fact this was repeatedly reported in the newspaper and no one fixed it speaks to the disdain we live with, as vehicle-dwellers. That brings me to the **third law** that allowed this internment camp to be an acceptable project, their most expensive

homeless solution in fact: *SFPD 97* which makes it a crime to eat or sleep in one's vehicle from 10 pm to 6 am. In 2019, it was amended by the Board of Supervisors to allow for this human trafficking enterprise called "safe parking". Excuse me for using such a harsh word, but what else is it, at $400 a night per RV with no electricity, no heat, suspect water, in a scary, remote location, guarded by angry ex-prisoners, lied to about "case plan funding" and thus falsely imprisoned, and of course, denied ADA-accessible showers. Socially isolated with a strict no-visitors policy. I have advanced breast cancer and I wasn't allowed visitors for the 31-months there. Constant invasion of seclusion with something they made up called a wellness check, two sometimes three times a day. On-site case managers (a.k.a. Free Services") who lied constantly and openly about our "case plan funding", laughing in our face over it, as well as hiring unqualified labor who damaged our RVs even more. A dystopian hellscape. Then they close it (thank you!), dump 20+ RVs on the street, blacklist us from any services whatsoever unless we give up our RVs, now with tickets piling up, and regular threats by tow by SFPD (all our RVs are unregistered). Five already vanished. There was even a photo op by the new Mayor with "twelve Dept heads", in front of our RVs saying to the camera, "We have to do better, trash and RVs" same breath. This was about five weeks after HE had closed the VTC and knew that thousands of dollars were spent on an unlicensed mechanic.

What opened the floodgates of money to create Camp Dismal was the amendment to *SFPD 97* which referred back to *San Francisco Admin Code Chapter 119*. They broke those rules too. Only operable vehicles, and only for 60 to 90 days. But the one rule that brings me to the closing statement: case managers are to help "transition to non-vehicular housing". They meant to peel us away from our property from the get-go. That's why they made the material conditions unbearable. So we'd let go and move into the slums they provide for 30% of our income. An 81-year-old man died out there, March 4, 2024, on the coldest rain we had that year. No electricity. No propane. They never tried to move us on to a proper place to live. Affirmative failure. They stood in the way of repairs and registration so as to move ourselves to a legal RV park. Affirmatively blocking us from a proper housing solution, why? Because we live on wheels. My apologies to this Court for going off-road, which is what I call breaking the evidence rules and all the ways I am supposed to refer back to what I said in court by bringing up everything all at once for a final say. My excuse is medical. I am supposed to be dead in a few weeks, the tumor is about to break through the skin so I am waiting near the hospital for the event, the fight is to stay in my home, to die with comfort and dignity, all the while, these outraged papers I write, are a direct demand that the City stands down and does not tow my RV-home in the meantime. I will die without my home as I face the final stage of cancer. Especially after 30 months

and 21 days in the place they affirmatively placed me, next door to a radioactive shipyard. If you see me camping in front of City Hall in my car, festooned with signs, you'll know they seized my home, in violation of the fourth amendment and *Cal. Veh. Code § 22650(b).* I intend to take my last breath protesting how a fake agency that is the San Francisco Dept of Homelessness, how they usurped my right to die with dignity in my home *because* I am a vehicle dweller and they absolutely loathe gypsies and won't allow us a place to BE. A rough estimate looking at their grants and so forth, I'm looking at nearly half-a-million dollars spent in my name since putting me in their system Nov 16, 2020.

I filed an administrative claim on Jan 22, 2025 and will proceed to federal court with a proper Sec. 1983 lawsuit as my health allows. The HUD case itself is active and a filed claim. Lots of protections in those laws, you'd think, but alas, not for the invisible minority in America: the Gypsy. Here, today in front of you, I have brought this simple question about whether or not *WIC 8255* really means "tenant" or not (in spite of the legislators writing it 13 times), even for gypsies in "emergency housing". Of course we all know my true motive of going off-road was to show you - and everyone else reading this - what homegrown genocide looks like. Another harsh word the defendant has earned. But to explain, I simply close my Reply with the entire text of a memo from the U.S. State Dept, reminding all that in every article, every conversation, with the City, with HUD, and with the

press, and in my own books and academic papers, I have always asserted my ethnicity as a Traveller, and here it is, the federal government, on October 8, 2020 listing my group as one that has need of protection. I want to be remembered as having introduced the Gypsy Question here to you, today, because really, can they treat us like this, when it's our DNA that demands a different way of living? It's not our fault we live on wheels like our ancestors. It's the cities and the counties fault for not allowing us to be full and equal space and services to everyone else by providing RV parks. RVs belong in RV parks, not on the side of the street.

It's the racism, as defined here:

https://www.state.gov/defining-anti-roma-racism/

The Working Definition of Anti-Roma Racism* *adopted on October 8, 2020*

Acknowledging with concern that the neglect of the genocide of the Roma has contributed to the prejudice and discrimination that many Roma** communities still experience today, and accepting our responsibility to counter such forms of racism and discrimination (Articles 4 and 7 of the IHRA 2020 Ministerial Declaration, article 3 of the Stockholm Declaration), the IHRA adopts the following working definition of anti-Roma racism: Anti-Roma racism is a manifestation of individual expressions and acts as well as institutional policies and practices of marginalization, exclusion, physical violence, devaluation of Roma cultures and lifestyles, and hate speech directed at Roma as well as other

individuals and groups perceived, stigmatized, or persecuted during the Nazi era, and still today, as "Gypsies". This leads to the treatment of Roma as an alleged alien group and associates them with a series of pejorative stereotypes and distorted images that represent a specific form of racism. To guide the IHRA in its work, the following is being recognized: Anti-Roma racism has existed for centuries. It was an essential element in the persecution and annihilation policies against Roma as perpetrated by Nazi Germany, and those fascist and extreme nationalist partners and other collaborators who participated in these crimes. Anti-Roma racism did not start with or end after the Nazi era but continues to be a central element in crimes perpetrated against Roma. In spite of the important work done by the United Nations, the European Union, the Council of Europe, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and other international bodies, the stereotypes and prejudices about Roma have not been delegitimize or discredited vigorously enough so that they continue to persist and can be deployed largely unchallenged. Anti-Roma racism is a multi-faceted phenomenon that has widespread social and political acceptance. It is a critical obstacle to the inclusion of Roma in a broader society, and it acts to prevent Roma from enjoying equal rights, opportunities, and gainful social-economic participation. Many examples may be given to illustrate anti-Roma racism. Contemporary manifestations of

anti-Roma racism could, taking into account the overall context, include, but are not limited to:

- Distorting or denying persecution of Roma or the genocide of the Roma.
- Glorifying the genocide of the Roma.
- Inciting, justifying, and perpetrating violence against Roma communities, their property, and individual Roma.
- Forced or coercive sterilizations as well as other physically and psychologically abusive treatment of teh Roma.
- Perpetuating and affirming discriminatory stereotypes of and against Roma.
- Blaming Roma, using hate speech, for real or perceived social, political, cultural, economic, and public health problems.
- Stereotyping Roma as persons who engage in criminal behavior.
- Using the term “Gypsy” as a slur.
- Approving or encouraging exclusionary mechanisms directed against Roma on the basis of racially discriminatory assumptions, such as exclusion from regular schools and institutional policies that lead to the segregation of Roma communities.
- Enacting policies without legal basis or establishing the conditions that allow for the arbitrary or discriminatory displacement of Roma communities and individuals.

- Holding Roma collectively responsible for the real or perceived actions of individual members of the Roma communities.
- Spreading hate speech against Roma communities in whatever form, for example in media, including on the internet and on social media networks.

* The United States uses the term anti-Roma racism, as the IHRA working definition recommends that Member Countries use the preferred term in their national context.

** The word ‘Roma’ is used as an umbrella term which includes different related groups, whether sedentary or not, such as Roma, Travellers, Gens du voyage, Resandefolket/De resande, Sinti, Camminanti, Manouches, Kales, Romanichels, Boyash/Rudari, Ashkalis, Egyptiens, Doms, Loms, and Abdal that may be diverse in culture and lifestyles. The present is an explanatory footnote, not a definition of Roma.

Respectfully,

_____ _____

Ramona Mayon June 3, 2025

From: Jess Hughes
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); municustomerservice@sfmta.com
Cc: mtaboard@sfmta.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: Concerns and Request for Clarification on New Oversized Vehicle Parking Restriction
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 10:06:53 AM

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

Dear City of San Francisco,

I'm writing to express concern and request guidance regarding the new policy signed on July 29, 2025, which restricts vehicles over 7 feet in height from parking for more than two hours in the city. While I understand the need to manage urban parking, this policy raises concerns for visitors, residents, and small business owners who use high-top vans for practical and legitimate reasons.

I live full-time in a converted Ram Promaster high-top van. I do **not** reside in San Francisco, nor do I live in my vehicle while in the city. I visit occasionally—usually a few times per year—to stay with my friend and her family in the Glen Park neighborhood and to attend events. Recently, I attended the Stern Grove Festival, a 5+ hour event. My van fits within a standard parking space and is parked respectfully on residential streets when I visit.

However, under this new policy, I could now be ticketed simply because my vehicle is over 7 feet tall—even if it's parked legally for a reasonable amount of time during an occasional visit.

Additionally, I'm deeply concerned about the risk of car break-ins in San Francisco. It's well known that vehicles parked in paid lots or garages are frequent targets, and I've personally avoided visiting the city more often for this reason. Being forced to park further away or in paid lots is not a viable or safe option for me, especially when I'm transporting valuable belongings or staying overnight with friends.

I'd also like to ask how the city plans to enforce this new rule:

1. Will all high-top vans be ticketed, including those used for commercial purposes or weekend/vacation travel?

2. In my friend's neighborhood alone, several residents own tall vans they park on the street—will they be penalized equally?

3. Will enforcement be based on clear criteria, or left to officer discretion?

I strongly urge the city to consider adjustments or exemptions to this policy. For example, a permitting process or consideration of vehicle length and use—not just height—could make enforcement fairer.

Thank you for your time and for considering the practical impact this has on respectful visitors and working residents alike.

Sincerely,

Jessica Hughes

jahughes212@gmail.com

760-509-5159

From: Allyson Ochoa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Permanent Housing for RV Residents!
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 9:30:06 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 in Supervisor Melgar's district 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. I'm particularly concerned that Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Melgar seem willing to accept non-specific commitments from the Mayor's office on refuge permits without pushing for more permanent housing offers for RV residents. The end result is likely to be families poised on a knife edge - waiting years for housing opportunities while constantly worried that their home may be towed if they make a single misstep.

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. We shouldn’t be worried about visuals more than people. The issue shouldn’t be that the RVs are there, our concern should be that there are friends and neighbors without permanent adequate housing. 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,
Allyson Ochoa

Allyson Ochoa
ochoa_allyson@yahoo.com
1475 18th Ave
San Francisco , California 94122

From: Rachel Speckenbach
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Permanent Housing for RV Residents!
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 9:49:19 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. I'm particularly concerned that Supervisor Chan and Supervisor Melgar seem willing to accept non-specific commitments from the Mayor's office on refuge permits without pushing for more permanent housing offers for RV residents. The end result is likely to be families poised on a knife edge - waiting years for housing opportunities while constantly worried that their home may be towed if they make a single misstep.

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 Speckenbach
rspeck3@gmail.com
540 SCOTT ST
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Ava Wallen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Permanent Housing for RV Residents!
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 3:09:38 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 Melgar,

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. I'm particularly concerned that Supervisor Chan and you seem willing to accept non-specific commitments from the Mayor's office on refuge permits without pushing for more permanent housing offers for RV residents. The end result is likely to be families poised on a knife edge - waiting years for housing opportunities while constantly worried that their home may be towed if they make a single misstep.

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,
Ava

Ava Wallen
avamwallen@gmail.com
1408 16th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Joy Pfeiffer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 4:28:36 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Dear District 7 Supervisor Myrna Melgar,

I am writing as a concerned resident of your district and a future mental health professional in the city of San Francisco to ask you to reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking in the city.

According to the June 5, 2025 Director's Report by the Homelessness Oversight Commission, we simply don't have enough resources to provide the people currently living in their vehicles – let alone the hundreds more living unsheltered on the street – stability or other options. The family shelter waiting list includes 295 families (872 people) and the adult shelter waiting list has 471 individuals. Of the families experiencing unsheltered homelessness accounted for in the 2024 Point-in-Time Count, 90% were living in a vehicle. Implementing a citywide ban isn't going to make the people living in them disappear or leave the city en masse; instead, this type of legislation will simply push people into further instability on the streets or see them uproot their vehicles elsewhere in search of safety.

A vital protective psychological factor for both individuals and families living with homelessness is the stability of routine (Keane & Shelly, 2024; Phipps et al., 2021). Laws like this imbue additional stress and disruption onto those who are living in their vehicles, putting them at risk of losing what little stability and safety they have. A study conducted in 2023 by Giamarino et al. on vehicular homelessness in Los Angeles cites research into the benefits vehicles provide relative to the alternatives — including safer, more stable, and secure shelter, and somewhere secure to store belongings. Access to a vehicle also allows more access to resources. (pp. 81-82). Giamarino et al. ultimately recommend cities reject policies that actively harm people experiencing homelessness, instead working to mitigate the challenges the vehicular homeless experience and carefully implement more programs and services that address their short-term needs while helping to boost successful transitions to permanent housing (pp. 88-89).

I'd like to see more effort put into providing more concrete assistance and long-term plans in place to solve the housing crisis, rather than punitive regulations that seek to further disenfranchise and destabilize those who are the most vulnerable. It is easy for people with everything to judge those who have nothing, but far more difficult (and worthwhile) to approach problems with compassion. Towing and displacement are temporary solutions devoid of compassion, simply meant to shift the sand into someone else's bucket rather than work to

build new foundations. Let’s be city that builds foundations.

Sincerely,
Joy Pfeiffer

Joy
California

Item 57

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)
Subject:	File No. 250661. Resolution No. 296-25 ICE - 5 letters
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 12:55:51 PM
Attachments:	5 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 5 letters, from members of the public, regarding:

> File No. 250661. Resolution No. 296-25 - Resolution condemning the abduction of immigrants by the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency (ICE) and urging strict adherence to due process, family unity, and humane treatment of migrants who safely and lawfully pursue their claims.

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: Rev. Victor Floyd
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: secret police
Date: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 10:26:52 AM

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

Honorable Mayor Lurie and Esteemed Supervisors,

I sponsor an asylum seeker. They have a major court date coming up, and I am terrified of the masked immigration employees disappearing them to a concentration camp. We have good legal representation and have made some plans should the worst happen. What else should we do?

Please do everything you can to prohibit the masked thugs from taking away our loved ones. I am a pastor of a large congregation. Does the city have our backs if immigration decides to enter our building on a Sunday morning?

We've taken some measures, but I am not hearing from the city clear strategies, contingency plans or strong countermeasures to defend our sanctuary values. It's hard to accept this is really happening.

Thank you for your leadership. You are all in my best prayers. I am standing by to help and hope to receive guidance from you.

Peace,
Victor
(415) 240-9204 private cell

Rev. Victor H. Floyd
He/Him/His/Y'all Why pronouns?
United Church of Christ
Metropolitan Community Churches
Calvary Presbyterian Church (USA)

My days off are Friday & Saturday. I may not read email on off days.

Please do not rely solely on *text messages* to communicate with me.

Privacy Notice - This material is intended only for the use of the individual(s) to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the originating sender's intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by telephone, and please delete the original message.

From:	Jamie Sheldon
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Refuse ICE cooperation and defend basic human rights.
Date:	Tuesday, July 29, 2025 12:13:18 PM

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

Board of San Francisco Supervisors,

It is your duty as representatives of your constituents to protect any and all who may come under threats from ICE. We are living under an unpredictable president who does not believe in laws that cover the rights and free movement
of immigrants who are of color. It’s outrageous he gave free entrance to white South Africans. I implore you to refuse
ICE cooperation and defend basic human rights to all who need it.

Sincerely,
J. Sheldon
94121

From: Priscilla Marquis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Illegal ICE detentions
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 7:45:32 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 request that the board of supervisors and the mayor take action to stop the illegal ICE detentions, particularly at immigration court.

They are arresting and detaining individuals who have legitimate immigration status and cases when they go to scheduled appointments and hearings. This is highly illegal and serves as a deterrent to our community members who are applying for immigration status. These are scare tactics and put all of us at risk. If they can illegally detain an applicant, then they can also detain citizens, as we have seen is being done.

Please act to stop these illegal activities immediately.

Sincerely,

Priscilla Marquis

Priscilla Marquis, Ph.D.
431 Bosworth Street
San Francisco, CA 94112
(415) 254-3306

Confidentiality Notice:
The contents of this email are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately alert me via email and delete the contents of this email.

From:	Allison DiMase
To:	Fielder, Jackie (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Kathryn.Angotti@sfgov.org
Subject:	ICE Arrested a US Citizen and Pepper Sprayed a Member of the Press
Date:	Wednesday, August 20, 2025 2:12:12 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Fielder,

My name is Allison and I am a constituent living in the Mission.

Today, ICE arrested a US Citizen and pepper sprayed a member of the press and a protester. I am writing to alert you of this and ask how you propose to move forward to protect people who are protesting the kidnapping of our community members by ICE.

Sources:

> Margaret Kadifa and Joe Rivano Barros "ICE agents pepper spray protesters, arrest one in downtown S.F.," Mission Local, 8/20/2025.
>
> Eddie Kim, "I reported from an ICE action on Sansome and all I got was a face full of pepper spray," *Gazetteer San Francisco*, 8/20/2025.

I am also outraged to hear confirmation that SFPD is assisting ICE today at 100 Montgomery, the immigration court. This is a direct violation of our sanctuary city values and policies.

I am writing to demand that you:

- Immediately stop SFPD from collaborating with ICE in any way.
- Investigate why officers are being deployed to aid ICE operations.
- Reaffirm and enforce our sanctuary city commitment to protect immigrant communities.

We need accountability and transparency. Immigrant families in San Francisco should feel safe, not hunted with the help of our own police department.

Can you tell me what steps you will take to ensure SFPD does not collaborate with ICE?

Thank you.

Allison DiMase

941 Capp Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: Donna Canali
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop SFPD from assisting ICE!
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 6:48:52 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,
I am a citizen and resident of SF and am outraged to hear confirmation that SFPD is assisting ICE today at 100 Montgomery, the immigration court as well at other locations. This is a direct violation of our sanctuary city values and policies.

I am writing to demand that you and the Mayor:
- Immediately stop SFPD from collaborating with ICE in any way.
- Investigate why officers are being deployed to aid ICE operations.
- Reaffirm and enforce our sanctuary city commitment to protect immigrant communities.

We need accountability and transparency. Immigrant families in San Francisco should feel safe, not hunted with the help of our own police department.

I volunteer as an observer in the immigration courts. I directly observe immigrants showing up for their appointments and doing everything they need to do for their asylum cases but still live their lives in fear. Others are so fearful of being arrested by ICE when exiting the court that they are too scared to show up.

Can you tell me what steps you will take today to ensure SFPD does not collaborate with ICE?

I would like a response as soon as possible please.

Donna Canali
825 La Playa St. #825
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	Acampersingh
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protecting our immigrant neighbors
Date:	Friday, August 22, 2025 6:39:21 PM

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

Hi,

My name is Asha Camper Singh and I am a resident of district 5.

I am heartbroken to hear confirmation that SFPD is assisting ICE this week at 100 Montgomery, the immigration court. This is a direct violation of our sanctuary city values and policies.

I am writing to plead that you:

- Immediately stop SFPD from collaborating with ICE in any way.
- Investigate why officers are being deployed to aid ICE operations.
- Reaffirm and enforce our sanctuary city commitment to protect immigrant communities.

We need accountability and transparency.
Immigrant families in San Francisco should feel safe, not hunted with the help of our own police department.

Other big city officials have spoken up or taken action in this way:

- Los Angeles Mayor Karen Bass bolstered prohibition of using city resources for ICE, expanded resources for impacted families, and confronted ICE at a raid
- Chicago Mayor Brandon Johnson vowed that Chicago PD will never collaborate with ICE
- Boston Mayor Michelle Wu, along with other regional elected officials, publicly condemned ICE tactics and urged federal investigation

Can you tell me what steps you will take today to ensure SFPD does not collaborate with ICE?

Now is the time we need you most.

Thank you,

Asha

Item 58

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); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	Family Zoning Plan File Nos. 250700 and 250701 - 252 Letters
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 1:09:28 PM
Attachments:	252 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 252 letters from members of the public regarding:

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 Sites 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.

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.

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:	Khalil Weldon Hoque
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Monday, July 28, 2025 1:27:57 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. We need to:

- Support Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan to allow more housing on the west side
- Allow taller buildings near transit stops and major corridors
- Streamline the permitting process to reduce delays and costs
- Stop letting a vocal minority of NIMBYs block housing that our city desperately needs

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco remains a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

From:	Prodan Statev
To:	Fielder, Jackie (BOS)
Cc:	FielderStaff; Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Monday, July 28, 2025 1:55:16 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Fielder,

I'm a resident of District 9 (16th and South Van Ness). I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. We need to:
- Support Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan to allow more housing on the west side
- Allow taller buildings near transit stops and major corridors
- Streamline the permitting process to reduce delays and costs
- Stop letting a vocal minority of NIMBYs block housing that our city desperately needs

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco remains a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Prodan
487 S Van Ness Ave

From:	Michael Ducker
To:	Sherrill, Stephen (BOS)
Cc:	SherrillStaff; Chan, Connie (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); Board of Supervisors (BOS); act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Monday, July 28, 2025 3:15:41 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Sherrill,

I'm a resident of District 2. I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. We need to:

- Support Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan to allow more housing on the west side
- Allow taller buildings near transit stops and major corridors
- Streamline the permitting process to reduce delays and costs
- Stop letting a vocal minority of NIMBYs block housing that our city desperately needs

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco remains a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Carrie Barnes
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, August 2, 2025 11:28:03 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Carrie Barnes (thank you again!)

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Pauline Lambert
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, August 2, 2025 12:10:38 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

From:	Andrew Lee
To:	Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Cc:	MahmoodStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, August 2, 2025 12:45:31 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Mahmood,

I'm a resident of District 5. I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. We need to:

- Support Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan to allow more housing on the west side
- Allow taller buildings near transit stops and major corridors
- Streamline the permitting process to reduce delays and costs
- Stop letting a vocal minority of NIMBYs block housing that our city desperately needs

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Referencing the article for easy access - https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-28-how-popular-is-housing/

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue!

Best,
Andrew

From:	Thom Vavrina-Flores
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, August 2, 2025 12:54:33 PM

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

Dear Supervisors, I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan. As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live. Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Thom Vavrina-Flores
631 Ofarrell St

From:	Angelica Michela
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, August 2, 2025 3:26:10 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Angelica Michela
District 7

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Annette Billingsley
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Sunday, August 3, 2025 7:25:39 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Sent from my iPad

From:	Emily McDonnell
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Monday, August 4, 2025 2:35:01 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Emily McDonnell
94110

From:	Tracy Tran
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Monday, August 4, 2025 4:18:57 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

From:	Santosh Jayaram
To:	Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	MandelmanStaff (BOS); act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	Please act on SF housing needs..
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 6:13:16 AM

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

Rafa:

I am writing to urge you to prioritize more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

Too many families are being priced out, and our city is falling dangerously behind on its state housing targets—by about 90%. If we fail to act, we risk losing local control over zoning altogether. Building more homes isn't just about meeting quotas; it's about ensuring San Francisco remains a place where people from all walks of life can live, work, and raise families.

I appreciate your attention to this issue and your efforts to help make San Francisco a city that is affordable and welcoming for everyone.

Sincerely,

Santosh Jayaram

PS: I am a supporter of yours and appreciate what you do on the board. Thank you.

From:	Stephen Voris
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 4:55:21 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Paul
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	Yes! I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 10:16:29 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,
I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan. As someone who rented in the sunset for 8 plus years and recently switched to owning a home, yes, you betcha, pretty please, let's build more for all types and income levels and family sizes.

This seems to be in line with the polling. Polling consistently shows that the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is way, way, way behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.
Paul Foppe
2301 Lincoln Way
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	scarampi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebastiano Scarampi
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:57:22 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):i moved to San Francisco 50 years ago for its character and UNESCO world site beauty. Treating this beautiful, unique city like an unremarkable piece of developable land is a crime against beauty and reason. STOP IT!
Also, the city has lost by emigration since Covid enough population to render unnecessary the building of the mandated 80,000 units. Why this urge to destroy neighborhoods for the sake of increasing density that residents don’t want or need?

Sincerely,
Sebastiano Scarampi
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: koelsch1886@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Koelsch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 1:05:32 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Leslie Koelsch
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	4lisavukovic@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Vukovic
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 1:25:19 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Nothing about the plan tackles affordable housing. We have tons of empty warehouses in the Dogpatch and other neighborhoods that could be expanded. We shouldn't ruin well established, expensive neighborhoods with putting in new developments that ARE NOT affordable.

Sincerely,
Lisa Vukovic
San Francisco, CA 94108

From:	erikashe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Shershun
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 1:26:33 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Erika Shershun
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: bapresta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Presta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 1:29:40 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 long time San Franciscan, I am writing to express my strong opposition to Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan. While I understand the need to addres housing, this approach would encourage wide spread demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. High-rises are out of character with our neighborhoods and unafordabl for most San Franciscans.

We call on you to:

- Significantly reduce and scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Delay the January 2026 upzoning deadline to allow meaningful public input.

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

The upzoning may serve powerful developers, but it does not serve the people of this city. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Barbara Presta
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: mcheylin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Heylin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 2:05:41 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mary Heylin
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	shashacooks@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anastasia Yovanopoulos
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 2:19:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]

Dear elected officials,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
San Francisco, CA 94114

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of K. Schwartz
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 2:31:33 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): SAVE OUR CITY! We have 70K (?) new units already approved, let's add 15K more and STOP and see how the infrastructure holds up… build on the outskirts of town, like HISTORIC cities all over the world have done to expand. The Bayview is available, with a transit line there, don't destroy our Victorian neighborhoods!! In my neighborhood, Duboce Park is turning 125 years old soon, we love our quality of life with no density increases.

Sincerely,
K. Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: njzajac@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nancy Zajac
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 2:31:57 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Nancy Zajac
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: epml@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Larsen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 3:17:04 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Larsen
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	pete@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Solvik
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 3:19:19 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 San Francisco voting and tax paying resident, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Peter Solvik
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: patricia_sur@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Sur
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 3:31:07 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. I do support taller buildings in already-commercialized corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patricia Sur
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: ademas1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ANITA DEMAS
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 3:41:43 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 disgusted and disappointed in this zoning non-solution. It will be disastrous to the look, feel and fabric of our city. The fact that affordability is not the main goal and that all the up-zoning is occurring along high rent corridors is proof that this is not to solve the housing crisis but to enrich developers and those with a financial stake in the plan. Shame on you all for entertaining this.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
ANITA DEMAS
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 3:52:43 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: nuptial.51.boxes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of stephanie de maria
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 4:27:56 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

North Beach is a historical district and needs to remain so - no up zoning in the most dense neighborhood in San Francisco

Sincerely,
stephanie de maria
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: mary.hall.benjamin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Benjamin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 5:31:14 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: the Marina District is a charming “village” that retains the original buildings and atmosphere from its concept. The new ordinance to allow tall buildings will ruin this.

Sincerely,
Mary Benjamin
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: monicareina@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Monica Reina Kadner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 6:38:28 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I am not against creating real affordable housing for everyone but it should not be at the risk of destroying the soul of our dear city. High rises are not a good idea in a seismic area. We should build beautiful homes no taller than 4-6 stories and repurpose all those taller empty building that are already part of the looks in downtown San Francisco where a lot of people can also live and there is enough public transportation.

Sincerely,
Monica Reina Kadner
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: markphil711@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Philpott
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 7:15:27 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Greetings All,

I've lived in San Francisco since my mid-twenties, and have a five year Bachelor of Architecture with a concertration in Urban Design from Cal Poly, san Luis Obispo. I've toiled variously and called San Francisco home through a number of economic and population ups and downs. I think the current upzoning plans under consideration are too extreme, and will result in the displacement of existing businesses and renters that may not have a subsequent round of luck regarding housing or business endeavors. Vancouver, Canada undertook similar upzoning ideas, and the result was merely more and more luxury housing and or pied a terres, and the last time I checked some of the recently built luxury highrises in San Francisco aren't necessarily selling like hotcakes anymore anyway, so even more luxury housing seems less ideal.

An urban designer and professor from Vancouver suggested one solution is to make potential developments less dense and tall, and require a percentage of the new units to be available at below market rate. Often, developers can make money on new projects with a few concessions, it's just that their boatload of profit would be smaller. I don't think a smaller profit boat is too great a burden on developers.

Too, if indeed, the state government is brow-beating San Francisco into creating new housing asap, well, the commercial vacancy rate downtown, in the commercial core, is still at about 35%. That's one out of three square feet sitting unused. I suggest getting together development incentives for the conversion of commercial to residential, and simultaneously (maybe it would be somewhat easy for liscensed architects with a certain scope) compile a list of the manditory conversion procedures necessary (air ciruclation systems, fires egress stairwells, etc) in order for "Sally Developer" to somewhat expiditiously approach such a conversion process. The thing is, even if some of the downtown buildings are not exactly the most graceful of architectural sculptures, they are already there, and their conversions won't drastically change San Francisco's overall existing urban texture, nor destroy view corridors, nor displace businesses and tenants.

Please please be careful with upzoning. San Francisco's a neat place, and you could destroy that forever. That's in your grasp. What about more housing projects on wasted flat areas out in Hunter's Point, Mission Rock, or Dogpatch: ie, in the SE corner of the city? You really can't expect to shove 60,000 housing units out in the Richmond and have everyone there on board for the new deal. Please please think about what you're doing.

And I hate to bring this up but we're not even really talking about housing the working class can afford. People won't Bart on over to scrub toilets at the Hilton until the end of time. We need housing people in the 50k to 100k a year income bracket can afford. It's nowhere these days. And then too there's housing 8000 homeless. We really need a comprehensive housing for the future strategy and plan that includes homes for people all the way from homeless to 150k a year. Okay thanks for your time and have a great day.

Sincerely,
Mark Philpott
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: marlowekarl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marlowe Bjorklund
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 7:50:07 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Maintaining the architectural and cultural integrity of San Francisco is possible while also finding ways to add more housing and address issues like homelessness in our city. The need is to develop our city without becoming something we are not. We need to focus on adding more public housing and transport to allow easier access to our "working" neighborhoods. Save the city's architectural history and spirit.

Sincerely,
Marlowe Bjorklund
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	deniselleck@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Denise Selleck
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 9:52:48 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Denise Selleck
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 10:23:31 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
SAVE OUR CITY! All over the world HISTORIC cities have preserved their original core, spreading out new housing in the periphery. Build in SOMA, in the Bayview, etc.
In my neighborhood (D8) Duboce Park will soon be 125 years old, and we love the existing ambiance/density. Don’t ruin it!

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: meilie.wong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mei Lie Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 10:33:39 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):San Francisco does not need anymore expensive high rise buildings. Do something about the empty buildings down town. If another college or school comes to the city, where are those service people, professors, students etc. going to live. Are they going to be able to afford more of the same that has already been built?

Sincerely,
Mei Lie Wong
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: carolkellyclark@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol Clark
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:09:25 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Carol Clark
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:16:55 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Peter Lee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: marcimander@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marcia Manderscheid
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 5:39:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I have enjoyed living in Pacific Heights for more than 50 years. Please take another look and revise this destructive plan.

Sincerely,
Marcia Manderscheid
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: merijohn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of George Merijohn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 5:45:24 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 respectfully request that you:

1) Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

2) Substantially scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps

Mayor Lurie's current housing plan will be voted on by the Planning Commission on September 11, 2025. If I were not scheduled to be away from SF that day, I would be at this meeting to offer my opposition argument in person.

I am deeply invested in San Francisco and have been for 40 years: I live here, work here, vote here, volunteer here, run businesses here. Please revisit this plan now. It is a free pass to demolish existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and transform our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. There is no guarantee of substantially increasing affordable housing in this plan and this is what SF needs the most. We don't need to build more luxury high rises in the city.

Please don't let the lobbyists and politicians who stand to profit from this plan permanently disfigure and diminish the quality of life of the people who live and work here.

SF does not need to be sold out to the highest bidder for short-sighted gain. The city needs a ground-up holistic 30 year sustainability plan, not a free pass to developers to stack in more lxury condos.

Mayor Lurie's current upzoning maps will impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and over building of luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers, lobbyists and conflicted politicians who stand to gain from it. They also gag and silence the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
George Merijohn
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: mathias1us@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marcy Israel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 8:35:30 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The corridors scheduled to be upzoned are inappropriate and out of proportion. There are many parts of the city that can be developed with higher buildings that are not now developed. Impacting neighborhoods is not the way to provide housing. What is the purpose for example of tall buildings along Fulton Street? It is to give "park view" housing, not affordable housing.

The charm of San Francisco is in the unique architecture of neighborhoods. Tall buildings also create wind tunnels and effect t he environmment.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan, which would encourage the demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and turn our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury towers.

This plan empowers developers, silences residents, and is being rushed to satisfy a state mandate that's outdated and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. That mandate should be challenged — not used to justify permanent zoning changes.

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 renters and small businesses
– Preserve neighborhood scale and historic character
– Require real affordability
– Slow the process and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape San Francisco forever. We need thoughtful planning — and leadership that listens.

Sincerely,
Marcy Israel
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: upzoneoverreachemail@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vance Nesbitt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 8:57:17 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO, SAN FRANCISCO!

Sincerely,
Vance Nesbitt
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: wi110w2ree@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Corey Bostrom
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 9:40:02 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
The Sunset sits on top of sand dunes and limestone, too soft for a mega structure that only rich people can afford. I most certainly hope environmental impacts will be done, cause lately it seems like our so called civic leaders are circumventing that process and doing what they want. I guess it's acceptable to create many more future sinking Millennial towers all over the place? Seems nothing was learned from that debacle.

How about stop letting foreign investors buy housing they don't live in that drive up the market making it unaffordable for actual residents and citizens to buy or even rent. Very sad when my childhood friend saves her money for years to purchase a house in the City she was born and raised in, only to have a foreign investor come in and out bid her with cash. This is ridiculous, I'm all for more housing, but there has to be a better way without stealing from residents and businesses.

Overall this is an AFFORDABILITY crisis. I see for rent signs all over, just way too expensive. So let's just displace the people already living here. Take more parking spaces and driving areas away while wanting even more people to live here. Steal whole blocks of land, displace people and lie. You guys don't care or listen to anything. Your way or no way.

I'm a San Francisco native and I'm sad and disappointed at what is happening. You can't even get the homeless situation under control and now with the upzoning and future land grab even more good hard working citizens and families will be up rooted. But then again it's beginning to feel like our City politicians only want rich people to live here, might as well gate the whole City off.

Sincerely,
Corey Bostrom
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: pat.gray8@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Gray
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 9:48:49 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):Senator Weiner and Mayor Lurie should be fighting against these changes at the state and local levels! They are both aware that the additional housing is not needed. Our neighborhoods need to be revitalized and both the roads and Muni services improved.

Sincerely,
Patricia Gray
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: irismvbucchioni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Iris Bucchioni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 10:45:10 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

San Francisco is a gem and it's character is made up of the many different neighborhoods within. Let's make sure these neighborhoods will continue to exist. The flavors and uniqueness of San Francisco are at stake. Preserve, protect, restore. Let's first focus on integrating the already approved construction for new housing and second, let's seriously look at our existing and unutilized buildings to meet the demand of affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Iris Bucchioni
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	upnup8@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Jang
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 10:47:43 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I would be ok with this type of upzoning if you could limit it to every other block or opposite corners. If you do this and you end up with 3-4 or 5 upzoned buildings on a single block, that would change sunlight access and mess up the vibe of the Richmond District.

Sincerely,
Amy Jang
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Ckar101@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kim Russo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 10:53:08 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Kim Russo
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: jknjl127@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jill Bittner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 10:53:52 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's shameful plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Please keep the beauty and charm of San Francisco intact. Don't turn SF into another ugly high rise disaster like Vancouver! Oppose the reckless and disgraceful sellout to developers of San Francisco through upzoning!

Sincerely,
Jill Bittner
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: shorak1234@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Steven Horak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 11:16:11 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Steven Horak
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	sbackman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Backman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 11:56:48 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress. Leave this old legacy neighborhoods alone. And move all of the concerts from Golden Gate Park to China Basin where there is less disruption!

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan Backman
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: msmc5354@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of M Chin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 12:17:56 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): This upzoning plan will remove much of the character that makes San Francisco an historic and beautiful city. Do not accede to these unfortunate plans.

Sincerely,
M Chin

From:	sunsetsandy98@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sandy Glover
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 12:43:21 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sandy Glover
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: janesmalley1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane Smalley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 12:58:35 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jane Smalley
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randy Mazzei
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 1:29:23 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Randy Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	bobby8400@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bobby Malhotra
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 1:38:33 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bobby Malhotra
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: judyrobosf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Judith Robinson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 1:58:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I strongly oppose all efforts to upzone large areas of San Francisco as proposed by the Mayor and District 3 Supervisor. The proposals abrogate much public input that is critical to radical changes in the city's design and demeanor. They falsely claim that they will increase housing, which at present is readily available in many empty buildings in the city.

The results would destroy the physical beauty of a city popular for that very reason with tourists and residents alike. I am a long-time property owner in the Telegraph Hill-North Beach district and supporter of preserving historic sites - NOT demolishing them in the name of misleading claims of providing affordable housing.

Please OPPOSE ALL UPZONING plans and listen to city residents' views on the subject.

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Sincerely,
Mary Judith Robinson
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	patricia_inez@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Thompson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 3:41:20 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.
I am a public high school teacher. The needs of the ordinary people, some of them poor, I serve are not being met by the massive upzoning that you are proposing. It benefits the developers and perhaps California senators like Scott Weiner, who is from back east, but it does not benefit children, elderly or middle-aged people in this city, and we are the people who elected you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patrice Thompson
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	shop@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of beth weissman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 3:48:22 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):This type of thing happened in the 60's and hurt SF unimaginably. The "buck teeth" on the water, the ugly high rises on Broadway, the list goes on and on. We live in SF neighborhoods to NOT be New York, to be able to see water and greenery. If you have to build high rises, build them downtown where it's already a high rise area. This is a ridiculous plan

Sincerely,
beth weissman
San Francisco, CA 94115

From:	bisho@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David F Bisho
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 3:51:46 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Gentlemen and Gentleladies:

Pls do not let this happen. Our area here, Westwood Highlands Association, a single family neighborhood, like the Planning Commission, by the way, is now over 100 years old.

It was 100 years of planning with its hard-fought and myriad of zoning designations that gave the city its culturally rich rand diverse charm that it still has.

Please do not allow this hijacking/developers dream to happen. You don't have to. I venture to say that NO resident in San Francisco wants it. Please.
Sincerely
David F Bisho, President
Westwood Highlands Association
www.Westwood Highlands.org
415-290-7267

Sincerely,
David F Bisho
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: kevin.durrance@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kevin Durrance
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 4:03:10 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline
- Take the time to craft a plan that does not create tall walls of buildings along transit corridors with no affordability guarantee. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to map out a more dense but still livable west side.
- The current plan bisects most of the impacted blocks. The plan proposes upzoning on one side of the block while holding current heigh limits on the immediately adjacent parcels (the other half of the impacted blocks). This penalizes residents like me on those adjacent parcels. It also lowers the probability that additional housing will actually be developed due to the higher construction costs of these tall skinny building on residential sized lots.
- I understand the logic of increasing density close to public transit corridors, but the upzoning should be spread out over larger areas. That would still be within 5-10 min walks to public transit. This would actually increase the probability of new housing being built vs. the current proposal.
- The proposed plan will turn 19th Ave from Lincoln to Wawona into a walled 6 lane road. Why was the upzoning not designed to have height breaks on 19th Ave by spreading the upzoning also along the adjacent streets from Lincoln Viicente? Your proposal walls off views to the ocean for everyone east of 19th Ave.
- I support upzoning and density increases in general, but this plan does more harm than good.

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

Sincerely,
Kevin Durrance
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: marinamorenous@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marina Moreno
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 4:46:04 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have been a resident in San Francisco since 1986. I've seen a lot of change, a lot of boom and bust, and participated in a couple of the Tech ups and downs myself, as I always worked in the City.

I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which promotes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and local/small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I design cabinets and closets for work, so I go to EVERY SINGLE corner of the city. I have seen how dead downtown office space is, yet a lack of planning on how all this empty space can be retrofitted to low and middle income housing. The answer is not to build more, but to MAKE IMMEDIATELY ACCESSIBLE all the space that is already there, and all the homes left vacant by foreign real estate investment speculators. WHILE LOWERING THE RED TAPE for home owners who want to organically add family and friend ADUs to make existing footprint a lot more dense.

All those luxury condos are simply second homes and pied-a-terre for rich people who have their primary residence in the suburbs and want a place to crash when they come party in our town. I know this is oversimplified, but I do see it first hand every single day, as these are my clients! Few of these new folks in new apartments are middle income people, NONE are low income people. Let's be real, please.

We demand that you:
- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Marina Moreno
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: stricker7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Raphael Stricker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 5:24:46 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I moved to charming San Francisco to get away from the crowds, noise and pollution of New York City. Please don't turn the charm of SF into the grit of NYC.

Sincerely,
Raphael Stricker
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: pass58@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of L Chin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 5:49:37 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- REJECT the Mayor’s upzoning maps, that SF citizens OPPOSE
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress. It is nothing but an excuse to shove destruction down the throats of every San Franciscan, while Lurie fails to address the actual problems of crime, drugs, public safety, homelessness and a worsening business environment with rational solutions.

Sincerely,
L Chin

From: sf21roger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roger Weinman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 8:57:08 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We will vote you out.

SF is for people, not VC$.

You will continue to thrive bc of your greed.

SF had a good run, until you and your VC buds.

Grow up,
RW

Sincerely,
Roger Weinman
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	vozalegre@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of L. Diaz
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025 11:24:06 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
It has been proven time and time again that renters affected by these displacements are rarely able to returned to the "new" buildings built after their exit.
This is also a "legal" strategy to eliminate rent controlled eligibility all together due to the buildings' new construction year.
Plus, there is the obvious lack of affordable inventory for renters to move to another equal living space than the one they were just forced to vacate.

Sincerely,
L. Diaz
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: danaamarisa@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dana Amarisa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 4:28:31 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

No to Mayor Lurie's plan!!! -
As a San Franciso Cow Hollow resident, living in the apartment that my great-grandfather built when he heeded the call the City made to anyone with the means to please build housing after the great earthquake of 1906, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:
- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would ruin my neighborhood. It would turn my home into a tourist area with high-rises built right next to my two-story house!! This imposes permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Dana Amarisa
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: sbogatsky@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sergei Bogatsky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 8:23:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sergei Bogatsky
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: mauberret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Raymond Mauberrrt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 9:04:19 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
Native San Franciscan apauled and concerned with unreasonable hight of ongoing and Proposed building projects throughout the city .
Potentially changing flavor and charm of this
Great city.

Sincerely,
Raymond Mauberrrt
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: sebraleaves@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of sebra leaves
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 10:06:36 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
sebra leaves
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: selizabethvaughan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Vaughan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 10:16:02 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisor Chan:

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

The plans will also destroy the architectural beauty and charm of San Francisco. Beauty and charm have value. Who wants to live in a Soviet-style hell scape of concrete high rises? A childhood friend from rural Pennsylvania recently visited. She had never been to San Francisco, and she was enchanted by even my comparatively architecturally dull neighborhood -- the Richmond District. She encouraged me to work against plans that would transform my neighborhood, uglify it, and eliminate the wonderful light that permeates the northwestern avenues.

I don't mind occasional CU authorization for taller corner buildings with high percentages of affordable housing. There are plenty of such corners along Geary Boulevard that could be so transformed. But I am also concerned about small, neighborhood serving-businesses -- my grocery stores, such as Del Rio on Clement Street (formerly "El Chico"), the market on 25th and Clement, the wonderful variety of stores on Lower Clement Street, east of Park Presidio. I am concerned about my corner cafes, my nearby hardware stores, the pottery studios that have been popping up throughout the neighborhood, my bicycle shops, pet stores, stationary and gift stores such as Gables, and the Eastern European delis. We also have a rich restaurant scene here. What happens when the buildings they are in are demolished? They are unlikely to be able to afford the rent in the buildings that replace them.

When I first came to the Richmond District 35 years ago, I took the 38 Geary west on Geary Blvd when the fog was rolling in. I felt like I was in the West Coast version of Brooklyn, and I felt as if the fog were calling my name. I lived in this neighborhood ever since.

Don't destroy it.

Moreover, there is quite a bit of housing construction going on in the Richmond District. In fact, in 2020, a 12-unit condominium building opened on what had been a privately-owned parking lot one block from me. Most of the

units were not yet occupied in 2020, but at least one was occupied by a woman who had another home in San Jose. This is NOT the kind of housing that San Francisco needs. We need permanent housing for people of average income. In addition, the retail space on the ground floor remains unoccupied. What small businesses can afford the rent in these new buildings?

Sincerely,
Susan Vaughan
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: jtomkins@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James Tomkins
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 11:15:10 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Clearly a rich interests power grab. There are much better solutions such as utilizing the 40k or so empty properties in SF. It also ruins small business and neighborhood character. We are watching this and aware how right wing $$$ SF politics really is and we will resist this strongly!

Sincerely,
James Tomkins
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: sourcherrycomics@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leah Morrett
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 11:50:35 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

As a small business owner in an impacted area, my business which serves the Mission District and more specifically a historically marginalized and underserved community (LGBTQ+, BIPOC), I am especially concerned for the impact that this will have on our community as it will displace my business and many residents in this community- including myself and my wife who also received this notice at our personal address. This is a major sellout to developers and greedy real estate lobby at the expense of our most vulnerable community members. Long term residents of working class background and elderly residents who have lived in their rent controlled apartments are at risk, and we cannot afford the "market rate" housing that will spring up at rates subject to the whims of greedy landlords.

The loss of my business and the many other small businesses that are in these areas will be a huge blow to the culture and community in this city- which is the very reason that people move here and visit this beautiful city to begin with.

This rezoning plan will have long lasting effects that will destroy the vibrant and diverse culture of this city, or what is left of it. This is a sell out to greed and monied interests that will leave San Francisco a lifeless husk of beige and grey.

Sincerely,
Leah Morrett
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: mollye303@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Molly Bodrato Gentile
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 1:22:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We moved to the Outer Sunset as a happy medium between city and suburban living. The taller buildings currently under construction have already changed the skyline and impacted parking for those of us who have no choice but to use personal vehicles. Mayor Laurie is doing an amazing job bringing this city back to life and this would be tarnishing what I'm sure will be an incredible legacy.

Therefor, as a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Molly Bodrato Gentile
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: kduffy217@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Duffy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 2:07:19 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (I grew up in Manhattan and saw first hand what gentrification and indiscriminate development can do to a city. Rents become unaffordable for most people leading to a massive exit of families causing,among other things, deterioration of public schools and so much more. These were the reasons I moved to San Francisco and now I’m witnessing it happening again. Please learn from the mistake of others.

Sincerely,
Karen Duffy
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: MARYROSS.ILLUSTRATOR@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MARY ROSS
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 2:37:13 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
MARY ROSS
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	parrott371@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of n d
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, August 7, 2025 3:01:41 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
n d
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: lauralou.sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Mulcrevy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 5:47:40 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): West Portal is already congested and there is no parking even now. I couldnt even imagine adding these buildings and the damage, traffic nightmares and gridlock it will cause.

Sincerely,
Laura Mulcrevy
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: kumasong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Kirschling
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 8:24:39 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 longtime San Francisco resident and renter of an apartment I cannot afford to leave, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I write to call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Karen Kirschling

From:	swissheidi67@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Heidi Bumann-Stucky
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, August 7, 2025 8:30:48 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 NATIVE San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

West Portal has always been known for its quaint shops. You will definitely destroy it’s charm by allowing this rezoning. It is a disgrace to dishonor the history, elegance, grace and charisma of an amazing part of San Francisco. We cherish West Portal. It means a lot to our neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Heidi Bumann-Stucky
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: erinkcronin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erin Cronin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 8:53:24 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. I especially oppose the demolition of rent controlled buildings. I live in one and I work in education and would not be able to afford to live in San Francisco without rent control.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Erin Cronin
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: tap4403@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of terry perrin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 9:29:59 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
terry perrin
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: gjnear2001@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of gary near
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 9:32:39 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
gary near
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: dedemac56@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ashley McDevitt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 7:13:38 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I am a homeowner in miraloma park and was born and raised in the sunset district. West Portal as you know is full of small businesses that I would sorely miss if they were disappeared. Please don’t allow our communities to succumb to the developers who want to build up so high with empty store fronts.

Sincerely,
Ashley McDevitt
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	barbarajroos@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Roos
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Friday, August 8, 2025 9:36:10 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Barbara Roos
San Francisco, CA 94111

From: lowell.nicholson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lowell Nicholson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 11:44:17 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

As a long term Sunset resident, I fear that these upzoning proposals will drastically change the neighborhood I love. I worry that upzoning will displace friends, neighbors, and businesses, and forever alter what makes this part of San Francisco so special.

Please please reconsider.

Sincerely,
Lowell Nicholson
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: pmulholl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Mulholland
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 12:52:42 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes & historic buildings, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. San Francisco is unique with its beautiful vistas for the public to enjoy, not just the chosen few. Height limits are necessary to stop greedy developers.

Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees. Such catering to the rich developers is disgusting.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please do not ruin the city!

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patrice Mulholland

From: wei.kong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wei Kong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 2:03:21 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
It is disappointing that the city officials again put its residents interests last. What the citizens need the most is reducing crime, homelessness and bring back businesses and tourism. Turning San Francisco into Miami beach is the last thing to bring back tourism.

Sincerely,
Wei Kong
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: fentco@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Douglas Fenton
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 2:06:20 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Douglas Fenton
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: charis44@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Valentine
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 2:23:53 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Catherine Valentine
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	matt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Matthew McGuinness
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Friday, August 8, 2025 2:26:58 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): As a 3rd generation San Franciscan, please don't destroy the neighborhood I've enjoyed all of my life.

Sincerely,
Matthew McGuinness
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: anniek092000@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of A Saxe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 3:05:01 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
A Saxe

From: judyt2009@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Tomsic
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 3:35:00 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I am tired of Scott Weiner making demands on San Francisco that are unrealistic when public transit and other limited resources are taken into account. Nothing in the upzone plan requires Muni to continue providing the transit lines that define a "transit corridor". And nothing in the plan requires builders to get started on already approved projects. Of course they don't mind waiting for more favorable interest rates and rental markets, as Assemblyman Weiner rewards them and penalizes our city if the housing does not get built!

Please stop this madness and design a plan that is both by and for San Franciscans of all income levels. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Judy Tomsic
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: richnavro2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Navarro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 11:50:10 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Richard Navarro
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: richnavro2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Navarro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 11:52:02 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Richard Navarro
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	rosenewton@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rosemary Newton
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 9, 2025 7:03:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I feel this plan will not benefit anyone but the developers and ruin the character of our city.

Sincerely,
Rosemary Newton
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: coreycatt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MARY MARCH
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 8:02:44 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Historic neighborhoods like Westwood Highlands were designed for single family occupancy with distinct architecture. Building high-rises here would ruin that. They should be built in places that make sense, like transportation corridors along places like West Portal and similar instead of destroying historic neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
MARY MARCH
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: lisa.arjes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Arjes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 8:06:57 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

The state mandate is an all-size-fits-one proposal that just doesn't work as it doesn't address the actual problem of affordability. San Francisco doesn't have a problem with supply as much as it has a problem with affordability. This is not a simple Econ 101 problem. Look at Vancouver. Vancouver tried to build their way out of a similar problem. Prices are still astronomically high.

Sincerely,
Lisa Arjes
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: info@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Max Ferman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 8:07:50 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I am terrified of losing my home and apartment of 30 years.
I am retired from UCSF, and will have nowhere else to go.
Please protect us.

Sincerely,
Max Ferman
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: disp006@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terrence McKenna
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 8:53:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optionalThere is plenty of room for new housing at the end of Geneva Ave and where the old Schlegel lock factory was. This would revitalize that part of the city. The weather is better on this side of town much less fog and more sunshine. Why destroy existing neighborhoods when there is plenty of room to build on the sunny side of the city. Some might say this is a rundown part of the city all the more reason to revitalize this area. Don’t ruin good neighborhoods. The Sunset , Westwood Park and Monterey Heights should be left alone these are great neighborhoods that do not need to change.

Sincerely,
Terrence McKenna
San Francisco, CA 94112

From:	Ryan Andrade
To:	CPC.SF.Housing.Choice
Cc:	Chen, Lisa (CPC); Yalon, Anne (CPC); Garcia, David (CPC); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Full support for Rezoning
Date:	Saturday, August 9, 2025 9:10:26 AM

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

Hello,

My partner and I recently moved to San Francisco and are happy new residents of the city and of district 8. You have our full support for the rezoning efforts to increase housing supply in San Francisco!

The process of finding a place to live was extremely difficult due to constrained supply and high demand. We are lucky that we found a place to fit our budget.

We love San Francisco and any hope of affordably renting or owning a place in the city depends on decisions like this to continually grow the city's housing supply!

Thank you,
Ryan Andrade

From: pariscp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paris Paraskeva
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 9:37:00 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. This plan will do nothing to address the affordable housing problem in San Francisco

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Paris Paraskeva
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: cdoyle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Doyle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 10:32:30 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: My family has lived in the West Portal area for more than 80 years. There is a neighborhood quality here that keeps us in San Francisco and supportive of our communities. The upzoning maps will destroy the look, neighborhood feel and the resulting community on this side of the city. We live here because we don't have the high rises and the bustle of downtown. We know and spend time with our neighbors. This is a special part of San Francisco that is unique and should remain that way.

Sincerely,
Catherine Doyle
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: andrew.hamill@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrew Hamill
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 10:44:23 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Andrew Hamill
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	lorenjjones@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Loren Jones
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 9, 2025 11:13:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Mayor Lurie,
My wife and I met you in Noe Valley before the election and told you you were going to win. We are native San Franciscans, we love our city, and we ask you to protect our neighborhoods.
Thank you,
Loren Jones

Sincerely,
Loren Jones
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	pedler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gary Pedler
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 9, 2025 2:27:35 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):I live at 576 Church Street at 18th. Church Street is one of the streets that will be most affected by the proposed upzoning plan. People like living in this neighborhood because it's built on a human scale, which this plan will completely subvert. It will do little to provide reasonably priced housing, force people out of existing housing, overburden the infrastructure, and destroy the character of a city that earns a lot of money as a place tourists want to visit.

I urge you to scale this plan back drastically and find a more measured, step-by-step approach to the issue.

Sincerely,
Gary Pedler
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: nanville@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joe Armenta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 3:13:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): SF Voters WILL REMEMBER...

Sincerely,
Joe Armenta
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: ga366@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gary Moran
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 3:41:41 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Gary Moran
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: mariannelhowell@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marianne Howell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 9:19:04 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

My whole family was born and raised in San Francisco. My mom was born and raised in North Beach, dad was born and raised in the Richmond district and my brother, sister and myself were born and raised in the Sunset district. We all went to school here. The mayors plan will ruin the city my family and I love. No one wants to look out their window and see giant buildings surrounding their home. These new buildings will just be eyesores throughout the city. People will lose the views they may have had. This is a horrible idea. It is not the right way to correct the housing situation. The city will look like there are projects all over the city. It will not beautify the neighborhoods around the city. Tall buildings belong downtown, not in the neighborhoods.
Please don't move forward with this awful plan which will ruin our city.

Sincerely,
Marianne Howell
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: judgold22@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Goldstein
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 10:00:51 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Judith Goldstein
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: jamielee6@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jamie Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 10:32:07 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jamie Wong
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: kellydanp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dan Kelly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 9, 2025 11:32:41 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live in Forest Hill and as a San Franciscan, I strongly endorse the overdue efforts to build more housing throughout the city, which has frozen housing expansion for decades, driving many families out of the city.

The proposal to utilize vacant plots along Laguna Honds Boulevard from Lawton Street is a no-brainer,
But this is a heaviy used and high-speed artery. Plans must include attention to pedestrian safety, adequate off-street parking, and increased MUNI service for the additional population.

Thje proposed development woukd be enhanced by rehabilitating the neglected open space to the north of Laguna Honda, so that it could be used for walking, birdwatching , etc.

Sincerely,
Dan Kelly
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: thanos@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Athanassios Diacakis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 10, 2025 5:28:50 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

You generally seemed to have lost the plot and are going with "more is better" rather than thinking through what you want to achieve.

More housing is not going to make cheaper housing... It's just going to make *more* housing. Look at NYC as an example.

You're just following the developer and YIMBY narrative and just plowing ahead with this silliness.

It's one thing to cause a bunch of destruction and achieve something, and a wholly different thing to create the same destruction and achieve nothing... which is where we are headed.

It's sad.

Sincerely,
Athanassios Diacakis
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: royacary@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cary Sunshine
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 10, 2025 7:37:19 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan, which would encourage the demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and turn our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury towers.

This plan empowers developers, silences residents, and is being rushed to satisfy a state mandate that's outdated and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. That mandate should be challenged — not used to justify permanent zoning changes.

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 renters and small businesses
– Preserve neighborhood scale and historic character
– Require real affordability
– Slow the process and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape San Francisco forever. We need thoughtful actions that our residents and your constituents can feel proud to have supported. This is not a win for San Francisco, it's as if it's the 60s; and we are being told we need super highways running through town. Please prevent our city from turning into a view less and overbuilt eye sore. Maybe we should have a vote?

Sincerely,
Cary Sunshine
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	coynesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cynthia Coyne
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Sunday, August 10, 2025 8:15:47 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Stop destroying what makes San Francisco a unique and desirable place to live. Mayor Lurie's plan will destroy the distinct character of our city and what drew my husband and I to move to District 7 thirty five years ago. There are already too many architecturally bereft monstrosities popping up in our neighborhoods, making SF no different from the cookie-cutter communities around the country. No wonder people are leaving, we are quickly losing our charm. Shame on you all for allowing this to happen. History will remember you!!!!!

San Franciscans deserve better!!! Families deserve better!!! Small businesses deserve better!!! You have over-stepped and you no longer serve the neighborhoods you represent, especially Supervisor Melgar!!!

We call on you to:
- stop hiding behind Scott Weiner's crappy bill and step up to defend our city
- stop re-zoning our neighborhoods. The Mayor's 'up-zoning' maps fast track our city's decline
- postpone the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline
- stop prioritizing real estate investors and developers
- start representing SF's small business and families for a change

We all want to see San Francisco thrive but this is NOT the way to do it. You should be ashamed!

Sincerely,
Cynthia Coyne
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	Christian Williams
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Sunday, August 10, 2025 8:54:52 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

~Christian J. Williams
District 6 Voting Resident

From: jlm211h@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Josine LaMonica
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 10, 2025 9:53:35 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I grew up in this neighborhood from the 60's to the 80's I still own my childhood home. This rezoning would destroy the area... surrounding areas like West Portal or Portola are commercial areas Forest Hills is a family neighborhood. Doing this would impact the family's and deeply change the demographic. Think hard about what you are doing, and not about the MONEY...

Sincerely,
Josine LaMonica
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: MICHAEL_DORF@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Dorf
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 10, 2025 9:59:32 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This is particularly problematic given the the bait and switch on the Covid-era street closures, which have now become permanent over the opposition of the majority of local district residents. If the City wants to add more more housing capacity, at a minimum all "Slow Streets" and the Upper Great Highway need to be reopened in order to handle the increased traffic that will result from this additional housing.

Sincerely,
Michael Dorf
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	gbirsinl@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Birsinger
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Sunday, August 10, 2025 4:02:41 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 San Francisco homeowner, I'm writing to express my serious concerns about the proposed rezoning that would allow 8-story buildings in single-family neighborhoods.

I'm not against addressing our housing shortage, but this plan feels like it's solving the wrong problem in the wrong way. First, the required housing numbers don't even account for the thousands of units already approved but not yet built. Why are we rushing to rezone when we haven't even seen what impact those existing approvals will have?

My bigger concern is what happens after we approve this. If affordable housing is truly the goal, where are the guarantees? How do we ensure these new buildings won't just become luxury condos that make our affordability crisis worse? I haven't seen any binding requirements or long-term oversight plans that would prevent this.

The height limit changes also seem to be painted with too broad a brush. Some areas might make sense for increased density, but others clearly don't - yet the maps don't seem to distinguish between them. You can't just draw lines on a map and call it good planning.
What really worries me is that this feels like it's setting up our neighborhoods for massive demolition and displacement of the people and small businesses that make these communities what they are. Once we make these zoning changes, they're permanent. But the January 2026 deadline feels arbitrary and rushed for something this consequential.
I'm asking you to:

Scale back these upzoning maps significantly and make them more targeted
Push for extending that deadline so we can do this right
Require real, enforceable affordability commitments, not just hopes and promises

We all want more housing, but let's make sure we're building for San Franciscans, not just for whoever can afford luxury towers. This deserves more thoughtful planning than what I'm seeing right now.

Sincerely,
Laura Birsinger
San Francisco, CA 94132

From:	noble.angulo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sabine Angulo
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Sunday, August 10, 2025 5:49:03 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sabine Angulo
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	minnettelehmann@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Minnette Lehmann
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Sunday, August 10, 2025 6:15:08 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Minnette Lehmann

From: sbogatsky@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sergei Bogatsky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 10, 2025 11:33:39 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sergei Bogatsky
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	bconnormurphy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brian Murphy
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, August 11, 2025 8:04:49 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan I have seen the City change over the decades and I understand the desire and need to make the City better. These upzoning ideas are prepared to destroy the diversity of neighborhoods the City offers. Not all of SF needs to be or should be high density. no one wants that. Additionally, the 3 projects on the West Side are all very close to each other and on a congested 7th Ave corridor. How these projects would pass an EIR is beyond imagination but I am sure the City will waive the EIR to let them proceed. Should we abolish all planning rules for everyone so that it is fair or will we work to destroy our cherished neighborhoods with high density only?

Please think of the permanent impacts of these plans. once destroyed neighborhoods can never recover. San Francisco's beauty is in part the diversity of housing options and single family neighborhoods.

We have all inherited a beautiful and vibrant City, we should endeavor to preserve what we love for future generations. Do not be a part of the group takes away the City's charm.

Sincerely,
Brian Murphy
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: maryvolkov@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary VOLKOV
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 11, 2025 9:42:29 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mary VOLKOV
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	robintoschi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robin Toschi
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, August 11, 2025 11:10:42 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a third generation San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
My family of Italian immigrants came here before the 1907 earthquake. We’ve never been wealthy, but we’ve always tried to make a positive impact on the City. My great grandfather helped found the crab fisherman’s association. My grandparents owned a well respected restaurant in North Beach.

Our neighborhoods have helped to make the City a special place to live and visit, helping to preserve the different groups that define it. I have lived in West Portal for 50 years and am proud to have seen it grow and change. However, I’m afraid that these zoning changes would so negatively impact our neighborhoods (not just West Portal) that they would lose the individuality that gives the City its identity.

Sincerely,
Robin Toschi
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: theharveysofsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Harvey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 11, 2025 1:20:28 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): These changes to 65' and 85' will take away the views we currently have for construction along 15th ave and the area in and around Taraval and Ulloa Sts. We barely have a view of the Farallon Islands and any height additions take that away entirely along with areas toward Lake Merced and Fort Funston. In addition even if the areas are along transit corridors, the current maps continue the area on Taraval to between Funston and Forest Side Aves. These do not have transit on the Taraval East of 15th Ave. That should be an area that is definitely removed if the criteria stated is followed. To add context as I have lived in and around this area for all of my 68 years and finished my City employment career as the Fire Marshal for the San Francisco Fire Department. I still work assisting Moscone Convention Center with fire and life safety as a part time employee. Most people I know are not against housing done in a scale and location that does not ruin the character of neighborhoods nor ruin enjoyment of these areas by changes so different than when we moved to or within these neighborhoods. The concept of few people having vehicles because little or no parking is required for these large developments that will make those developers wealthy does nothing for existing San Franciscans. People will visit these new tenants and park everywhere while increasing traffic and making it less safe for children and the elderly specifically. I have seen hundreds of stop signs and tens of signals installed of the years with many most recently. I have not stayed in San Francisco and raised my family to see the neighborhoods become more windy with little sun and lower quality of life. Many have moved from San Francisco and I do not want to be among them so please change these requirements and do not continue with the excuse of the State mandate. Housing can be built without these drastic changes to these neighborhoods.Areas around Lake Merced have apartment buildings with land adjacent where additional housing in taller buildings could be constructed without affecting the views and traffic as much as would be done with these current proposals. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Thomas Harvey
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: thdrift@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Darin Rosas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 11, 2025 3:56:36 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This will decrease the quality of life for already financially struggling families in SF with higher costs, less resources in a densely populated area, increased power outages with more strain on the grid, more crime, more economic division, more traffic, no affordable requirements, horrible for the environment & filling the developers pockets that most aren't even local.
Newsome & Weiner will have a very tarnished reputation after these projects, we ask you to make a difference & just say no to this type of development. Please demand a more methodical approach instead of this slapped & crammed approach. It didn't go well for Engardio nor will it bode well for any other politician supporting it..

Sincerely,
Darin Rosas
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: rgoodman311@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Goodman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 11, 2025 4:56:49 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Robert Goodman
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: tompacko@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tom Packo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 11, 2025 10:54:29 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 long-term San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods with unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I ask that you:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Sincerely,
Tom Packo
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: holyvo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Holy Vo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:09:46 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan of many years in this beautiful city, I'm writing to ask you strongly reconsider Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan. We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

What keeps me and many others who love these neighborhoods in San Francisco is the balance of close knit community and vibrant city living, and though we support the development of housing to accommodate the city's growing needs, this plan goes far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

I hope you will listen to the voices of the impacted communities while building a strong path forward for San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Holy Vo
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: echernyak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eddy Chernyak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 12:16:48 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Eddy Chernyak
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera Hatun Noguera
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 1:55:09 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 1:55:58 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 1:56:59 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: judigorski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judi Gorski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 1:57:13 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Thank you in advance for hopefully considering the needs of our community and supporting our position.

Sincerely,
Judi Gorski
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	hawaiian4life@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vincent Arroyo
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:07:53 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Vincent Arroyo
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: moonstar77@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carolyn Arias
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:10:18 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Carolyn Arias
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	kielykids@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of LaVive Kiely
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:16:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

How the heck do developers and the City expect to come into ownership of this land?! This smells an awful lot like the scandals of Redevelopment in the 60's and 70's when owners of properties South of Market and in the Fillmore were given a pittance for their properties. Most of the African Americans who lived there were never able to come back. My father fought losing his properties South of Market for YEARS! He grew up in one of those houses. His very elderly mother libed in the other. He was given $55K for 2 houses and a lot!

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
LaVive Kiely
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: chloeewallis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Chloe Wallis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:17:56 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Chloe Wallis

From: sarahvberman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah Voynow-Berman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:19:01 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): there has not been an environmental study YET on sewage treatment, building in sand dunes and overcrowding which is unsustainable near an ocean.
Build DOWNTOWN first. I don't see any supervisor or Weiner admitting that this drastic, knee jerk action would harm their neighborhood. Get big corporations to stop buying up properties to turn them into) to high rent or short term rentals which further erodes our community. Do that FIRST

Sincerely,
Sarah Voynow-Berman
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: forrestbice@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Forrest Bice
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:27:00 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): As a young person living and working in San Francisco I'm writing to you to break any preconceived notion that young people want more housing in San Francisco but even more importantly that we also can see that demand will always outstrip supply in this beautiful city we call home. More housing is _not_ a real-world solution to affordability in already dense areas and we have seen plenty of examples of that play out with severe and tragic consequences. You can only ruin a city once as they say and that's true! Manhattanization is not made up, it's a reality and it can and will happen in SF unless we act to protect our city; don't be duped or bullied into the narrative pro-housing advocates are spewing. San Francisco is beautiful and vibrant because of the way it is. I repeat: __You Can Only Ruin A City Once___

Sincerely,
Forrest Bice
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	cablecar@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wesley Valaris
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:40:11 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: DONT LET THE DEVELOPERS TAKE OVER. This is our town and this madness has got to end. There is a reason we love our neighborhoods and San Francisco. It is simply because of its small neighborhood/town feel. Look at every neighborhood and city that has fallen under the spell of bought paid for politicians. Every project has ruined its city for the enriching of a few. At what point do we disallow the greedy power grab to continue.

Sincerely,
Wesley Valaris
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	asmtoyou@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Mc Manus
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 3:41:16 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Amy Mc Manus
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: francesca_long@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Francesca Long
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 4:11:51 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): My family and my husband's family have worked long and hard to build lives here in the Sunset. Please do not turn these neighborhoods into endless massive apartment buildings. It does not create more affordable housing and simply forces people out. It simply destroys neighborhoods. There are other areas in the city that are vacant and can be bullt up! We will need to spend money to build out transit to those areas but it will be better spent rather than destroying existing neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Francesca Long
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: stefano@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stefano Carissimo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 4:36:44 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Stefano Carissimo
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: justinreplys@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin Dumas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 5:04:32 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Justin Dumas
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	mshapiro49@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marni Shapiro
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 9:54:13 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Marni Shapiro
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	tworose@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bethellen Levitan
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:06:06 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Bethellen Levitan
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: tworose@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Beth Levitan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:06:26 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Beth Levitan
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: elyse.aylward@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elyse Aylward
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 6:20:56 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Please do not ruin my neighborhood with large multi-unit buildings. I have lived here for 67 years and I do not want more people. It's already too crowded with cars since you closed the Great Highway. Find another way. Turn all the empty office buildings downtown into housing and stay out of the Sunset neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Elyse Aylward
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: elemjw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lin Joe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 7:53:17 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I have lived in the Sunset for over 40 years and have seen many changes. For the most part they have been positive and I feel the neighborhood has benefitted from the gradual development. My grown children continue to reside here and raise their children in the Sunset too. We love the neighborhood.

However, this Upzoning Plan is disturbing in that it allows massive development and doesn't really address the affordability issues we have in SF. In addition, there are already approved plans for big developments in SF that haven't even started (!)

Please don't allow this extreme upzoning.

Sincerely,
Lin Joe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: 415irisheyes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elizabeth Faliano
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 10:03:42 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): The attack on the Sunset community is criminal. The Sunset has always been a quiet sleepy beach neighborhood. There is not a housing shortage in SF to be building such large scale, out of character buildings, there is an affordability issue. Plus the Sunset does not have the infrastructure for multiple building units nor the parking no thanks to the SFMTA.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Faliano
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: timothy.ryan151@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Timothy Ryan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 10:12:16 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

We have been property owners since 2004, and we dont want to see our already crowded city become more overrun, services and infrastructure overtaxed, and businesses forced to leave the city to avoid this craziness. Please be mindful, seek reasonable growth where able, and invest in the future by taking care of what we have now, not building more only to get trampled by the congestion and overgrowth. Thank you for your time

Sincerely,
Timothy Ryan
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: bailey.kathyr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathy Bailey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:36:49 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 San Franciscan living in neighboring Haight, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Kathy Bailey
San Francisco, CA 94122

From:	inor@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of R. Zierikzee
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 13, 2025 2:08:40 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I fear this will make more residents of San Francisco homeless ... right at the time it's becoming illegal to be unhoused. I may well be one of them. I'm a disabled senior living on a fixed income and if the owner of my building decides to demolish the building I live in to upzone to a larger building I will be out. I cannot afford to move to another apartment. I will be homeless at age 72. I do not support the mayors plan for more housing. There must be a better way.

Sincerely,
R. Zierikzee
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	anthony@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anthony Mazzei
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 13, 2025 2:37:30 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): This only makes more traffic, more litter, noise and other issues. We are already dense with touching houses. We already share walls. This is one of the few places in the city we can still raise families.

Sincerely,
Anthony Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: karenmillerwood@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Wood
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 7:21:44 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
It appears that California has been bought and paid for by the building sector, whose chief advocate is Senator Wiener. San Francisco's population "is currently declining at a rate of -2.6% annually and its population has decreased by -11.78% since the most recent census, which recorded a population of 870,518 in 2020." [https://worldpopulationreview.com/us-cities/california/san-francisco]. What justiifies the Mayor's extremist Upzoning Plan and its devastation of San Francisco's unique neighborhoods? If upzoning is such an excellent idea, put it before the voters and find out how they feel about the massive changes proposed for their city.

Sincerely,
Karen Wood
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: informationmistress@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lori H
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 7:57:40 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I've been a resident and homeowner in San Francisco for over 35 years, living in District 2, District 4 and now District 6. Of course, I understand there's a homeless and affordable housing crisis in my beloved city, but taking away local residents' control and say over neighborhood zoning, building heights and development in deference to developers and billionaires is the exact opposite of what San Franciscans need.

Sincerely,
Lori H
San Francisco, CA 94103

From: sffred@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fred McFadden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:08:29 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 49 year San Francisco resident, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

This upzoning plan will not lower housing costs. It will ruin the charm of our neighborhoods. It will increase commercial rents, and discourange small business and local independent restaurants.
Entrepreneurs of all kinds, small boutiques, art galleries, restaurants, and business will not be able to afford to open and sustain their businesses.
Please don’t Manhatten-ize the Sunset.

Sincerely,
Fred McFadden
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: phil.lumsden999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip Lumsden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 9:13:33 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Philip Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: food-mimosas.01@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of R Curry
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 10:14:24 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Forest Hill is one of the few historic neighborhoods that must be protected. Converting residential zones to commercial zones is a huge mistake.

Sincerely,
R Curry
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	patriciacalfee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Calfee Picache
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, August 14, 2025 1:24:54 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan.

This is a mistake and one that will greatly impact our neighborhoods and quality of life. Having grown up in San Francisco, and now choosing to raise my own three young children here, I am disappointed to see the Mayor taking such ill-planned action.

I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps

- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Patricia Calfee Picache
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: picache@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ian Picache
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 3:03:04 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Ian Picache
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	samanthamostovoy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Samantha Mostovoy
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, August 14, 2025 9:43:41 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Samantha Mostovoy
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	madatian.j@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jasmine Madatian
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Friday, August 15, 2025 7:01:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Thank you for your time and consideration - protecting the character of our city is critical.

Sincerely,
Jasmine Madatian
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: fraley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Fraley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 15, 2025 9:59:53 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Fraley
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	maury.raycroft@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maurice Raycroft
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, August 16, 2025 9:14:28 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I encourage the Mayor to watch a recording of the June public meeting, where many voices discussed clearly, and interesting, uniquely how detrimental the current rezoning plan would be, causing more harm than good.

The current plan to simultaneously upzone 13,000 acres of SF is reckless and does not address affordable housing.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Why doesn't the City focus on getting vacant properties (40,000 vacant homes in SF, not including the growing amount of unoccupied commercial space) occupied? The City can encourage/incentivize landlords with vacant/derelict properties to update and make them available — if vacant, mandate extra taxes; if it remains vacant mandate a rent cap for affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Maurice Raycroft
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: zamarripamaz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Anne Zamarripa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 16, 2025 6:43:02 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 Native San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
Mayor Lurie, I had the pleasure of meeting you when you had supported the group re The Boulevard (Sunset).
I was hopeful, excited, engaged everyone I met to make sure that they knew your name and to make sure they got out to vote!
Even when people brought up your background (financially) it was an easy response…Lurie comes from money which WORKS for us! He won't be swayed OR bought!" That resonated with people.

I request that this 'zoning' issue be seriously and not destroy the fabric of our neighborhood.
As you know, there are many, many buildings downtown. Use them. Yes I know they would need renovation…and the deep pocket 'developers' won't make their money, however, renovations would employ so many of our Bay Area people.

Think, think, think…about us, the people who believe in and voted for you. I'm counting on you!
As one Native to Another.
maz
415.987.3550

Sincerely,
Mary Anne Zamarripa
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: rachaeltauber@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rachael Tauber
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 17, 2025 4:46:37 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rachael Tauber
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: comradeknick@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nicholas Fay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 17, 2025 11:18:04 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Nicholas Fay
San Francisco, CA 94102

From:	cfjohnso27@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Connie J
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Sunday, August 17, 2025 12:14:45 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I live in the Sunset district and this plan threatens our family-friendly community in order to blatantly benefit big developers and tech investors. Please try to make San Francisco a city for everyone — not just the super rich.

Sincerely,
Connie J
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 18, 2025 1:48:11 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: zarina.issac@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Zarina Issac
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 18, 2025 2:42:42 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please stop with unaffordability. The free market won’t fix this!!

Sincerely,
Zarina Issac
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: kbaum88@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Daniela Kirshenbaum
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 18, 2025 2:53:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Why are you giving away our city to developers? They aren't city planners. They certainly don't build for affordability.

This proposal, which nobody in city government including the Department of City Planning seems to have any problem with, proves the naysayers right about "neoliberals."

Sacramento also wanted to build a freeway through the Golden Gate Park panhandle. How does that sound now? Like Sacramento still has all the answers? If so, then why do we need a Dept. of City Planning at all?

The ultra-capitalist, trickle-down economics of "let the market solve the problem" displays some poorly hidden greed, I'm afraid. And that is certainly not helping with the adorable "Family Zoning" brand...

Sincerely,
Daniela Kirshenbaum
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: tkpassat97@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tim Keefe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 18, 2025 8:29:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hello,
My family has lived in San Francisco for over 100 years. Blue collar, middle class, hard-working, elastic, intelligent, ready to change careers based on the environment and jobs available, kind, with strongly held beliefs that you give back as a duty to your community and country.
My family worked very hard to be able to live in an area that is safer, quieter, and more connected. Forest Hill.
Born and raised obviously, I have friends from hunters point, the Fillmore, the Mission, family in the sunset, and all over. Growing up my friends who had section 8 housing couldn't even trust their neighbors, they would get stolen from constantly, and when people can't afford what is around them, they resort to criminality in many cases.
Putting this type of housing on Laguna Honda, where are these people going to shop? Tower market? Where are they going to eat? Everything around these areas is tailored for people in middle class and upper middle-class surroundings. We worked hard to live in these areas. You're going to set these people up for failure.
Theft is barely even reported nowadays in San Francisco, every time I go to the store I still see it. I never saw it ever for years on end growing up in the city.
Putting people sandwiched between Forest Hill, West portal, UCSF, Twin Peaks, Saint Francis Wood is not setting low income folks up for success.
I volunteered with CASA, Saint Vincents home for boys, little children's aid, as did my parents before me for decades. Ask them what will happen.
San Francisco has some problems all right, but these problems require intervention way before housing issues. We live in the western banking capital of the US, the tech capital of the US, yet we graduate people or barely graduate people who can do math, who have a little understanding of what career opportunities exist in this SMALL CITY.
I fear these are Band-Aid fixes.
In your desperation to quell loud minority voices, minority in number, you are overreaching it seems on where you are putting housing, what zoning tactics you are using, what type of economics are at play, and how communities that have been around for nearly 100 years will be affected. We are the ones that make San Francisco run. I own a company that deals with ballot initiatives, referendums, I do candid work, I know better than most.
I urge you to take these things seriously, this location is not where this type of housing needs to be.

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Tim Keefe
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: nleong777@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Norman Leong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:50:14 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Norman Leong
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	irinakitrar68@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Irina Kitrar
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, August 20, 2025 7:37:10 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Irina Kitrar
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Lizajalalian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Liza Jalalian
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 8:00:58 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Liza Jalalian
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Lizajalalian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Liza Jalalian
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 8:01:16 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Liza Jalalian
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: randaghnaim@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randa Ghnaim
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 8:54:54 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Randa Ghnaim
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: ho.robt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Ho
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 7:28:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Robert Ho
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: klschulkin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of karen schulkin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 10:29:31 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):I live on a corner that could be demolished and converted and the image of how this would make the neighborhood look is just unimaginable. This is a very bad idea and I am not in support.

Sincerely,
karen schulkin
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	hulaladog@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Toni Hur
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:07:20 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Toni Hur
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: morrison.donna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Morrison
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 9:41:14 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

FIFTY YEARS I've owned and lived in my Gough Street Victorian

and FIFTY years I've worked hard to keep my neighborhood a REAL neighborhood.

The deal you and like officials have made with the land speculators and developers and lobbyists will NOT help FAMILIES afford to live in this City...and it will only degrade these neighborhoods you have targeted for up-zoning.

Money is the voice that speaks now...not those of us who live here and pay taxes here and voted for you.

I say it is a sham and a disgrace to your office.

Shame on you.

Sincerely,
Donna Morrison
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Vincent Casey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 1:30:42 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Vincent Casey
vinmcasey@gmail.com
1441 Hyde Street
San Francisco, California 94109

From: gingerpepper@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ginger Pepper
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 4:26:11 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I have lived now for over 60 years throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods, especially when as a single mother it was affordable, and that is what is so special about San Francisco. I've traveled to many cities throughout the world, but San Francisco has a character neighborhood community like no other. However, it has become out of reach for the average American worker, single mother, especially the American dream of buying a home here in the city. I have seen SF change many times culturally and economically, but present day zoning deregulations are changing the intimate community/culture of San Francisco. I live in the sunset most of my life, children went to Herbert Hoover, McAteer high school, riding Muni through out the city. Building anything more than 4-12 stories becomes intrusive to the residents blocking the infamous Sunset views we are known for. I voted for mayor Lurie because he promised to restore the city to become a city for all of us and he was going to make it more affordable. Rezoning and destroying homes is not making real estate affordable. This is not Newport Beach. Our dictates otherwise.
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional

Sincerely,
Ginger Pepper
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: andrewchou90@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrew Chou
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 8:25:35 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Forest Hill has been my home neighborhood since I was born, it's a peaceful oasis for residents, in contrast to busy downtown. It's suburban streets, nature, and calmness creates an escape for many commuters who work in busy cities. This new plan of transforming out neighborhoods would be absolutely detrimental to the original residents of Forest Hill. These types of projects historically have never worked, and have turned the original neighborhoods into under-resourced wastelands- take Detroit for example. We beg of you, to please not push forward with this project and preserve our beautiful neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Andrew Chou
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Jordan Enriquez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2025 10:53:44 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jordan Enriquez
pst.atev94@gmail.com
164 Hartford St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Michael Curtian
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2025 10:59:01 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Michael Curtian
hi.im.mikey@gmail.com
650 Alvarado St, Apt 203
San Francisco, California 94114

From: irinakitrar68@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Irina Kitrar
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2025 12:10:01 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

I've been living in the outer Richmond and regularly visiting the sunset for the last 26 years, and there is a legitimate reason this community feels an immediate threat from these potential plans - it directly affects the quality of living and safety that has been so precious to us in this area, without any positive or desired outcomes for it's residents. We want to still be able to see the sun and sky from anywhere on the sidewalk. We don't want corridors of 10, or even 6 story buildings. We don't want to displace people from their homes even if its "temporary." We don't want to kill small local business. And we don't trust you to deliver actual low-income housing in these developments, particularly when there is no guarantee of that outcome.

Sincerely,
Irina Kitrar
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	rglogau@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Glogau
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Sunday, August 24, 2025 4:12:07 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

The upcoming upcoming plan will profoundly affect the neighborhood appearance and effect a loss of open space, a commodity that has become a diminishing entity as the developers fight over the few open parcels left in the city. As anyone can see from the new construction on Stanyan Street, the aesthetics will likely be more aligned with the inhuman designs associated with the housing blocs of the former Soviet Union rather than something compatible with surrounding residential neighborhoods. These projects will further contribute to the traffic congestion along 7th avenue and will never return to tolerable levels.
If the city must comply with the mandates imposed by the State of California, then make use of the empty spaces in the defunct and derelict commercial zones in the city, e.g., the Sixth street corridor or the abandoned Westfield Mall, or the run down business sites in the South of Market area. Do not pretend that you represent the best iinterests of the residents of the West Side by shoving this down their throats.

Sincerely,
Richard Glogau
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Nadav Wichmann
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2025 7:42:48 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

To whose eyes may glance at this letter-

Thank you for all you do, as I do believe the public sector is an honorable and just service, of which is not always understood.

That being said, I am writing in support of this specific idea for more housing (Family Zoning Plan). To be frank, I wish I could voice my support more concretely, but policy writing is confusing to me and I am unfortunately- both a rather slow reader and a busy individual. I am supporting this plan, because I think it supports my hopes and aspirations for San Francisco as a city, but in case I am wrong let me write my aims here.

I moved to the city just 6 months ago from a town about an hour North, and I consider it to be one of the best decisions I have ever made. My number one objective in regards to San Francisco's politics is to allow others to do the same. My understanding is- the only way to have this be feasible for others my age, or below my level of income, or those dealt worse hands than mine, is to Build More Housing.

I realize this can't be solved with one plan and with out the commitment to change on behalf of the people, but my ask to you is, to try pushing change on your side, and we + I will trying pulling on ours.

Thank you kindly and much gratitude,
From- Nadav B. Wichmann 8/24/25

Nadav Wichmann
nadavwichmann@gmail.com
1220 14th Ave.
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Jorge Correa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, August 25, 2025 6:14:51 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jorge Correa
mexicopatriot1810@protonmail.com
14526 Hemlock Street
San Leandro, California 94579

From:	mnchapman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Matthew Chapman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, August 25, 2025 9:44:28 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I understand the need for more housing, but this proposal completely ignores the character of the area and will create an ugly, congested cooridor that will become a source of regret in the coming years. I urge you to reconsider, review, and rebalance the proposal to integrate new housing into the area in a way that fits the landscape.

Sincerely,
Matthew Chapman
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Tim Hua
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, August 25, 2025 10:30:38 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors & Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Tim Hua
cool_tim_rx@outlook.com
1920 Yolo Ave
Berkeley, California 94707

From:	john.kaman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Kaman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 26, 2025 9:16:03 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement .

Sincerely,
John Kaman
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: jwiggsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jessica Stein
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 10:04:11 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a native San Franciscan living on the West Side, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Please reconsider this plan!

Sincerely,
Jessica Stein
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: dinaegoldman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dina Goldman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 10:21:32 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I do not understand why this plan cannot be implemented in a more thoughtful way. You can meet your goal of increased housing without destroying existing residential neighborhoods. We live in ingleside Terraces, which is a historic neighborhood that was thoughtfully planned. It is very walkable, has lots of natural light, many birds, and lots of beautiful landscaping. We do not want our neighborhood drastically changed. And it is not necessary to implement a plan with such a broad brush-- areas of the city that can support larger buildings exist, and you can implement there, as opposed to everywhere.

Sincerely,
Dina Goldman
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	mikejnohr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Nohr
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 26, 2025 11:20:53 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): The city doesn't even maintain the affordable and subsidized housing we already build. Their are several blocks in the Western Addition that were built around 2000 that are slated to be bulldozed due to mold and poor maintenance. $100s of millions wasted. And, the city population 75 years ago was 775K. Today, it is 810. We have plenty of housing. Help people who need help to stay in their homes instead of funding developers at $1.2MM per unit.

Sincerely,
Michael Nohr
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: lakkisf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fadi Lakkis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable [File No: 250700 and 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 2:17:30 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan, which would encourage the demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and turn our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury towers.

This plan empowers developers, silences residents, and is being rushed to satisfy a state mandate that's outdated and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. That mandate should be challenged — not used to justify permanent zoning changes.

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 renters and small businesses
– Preserve neighborhood scale and historic character
– Require real affordability
– Slow the process and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape San Francisco forever. We need thoughtful planning — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I support protecting the character of San Francisco, a unique gem in the whole wide world and the reason my wife relocated here a few months despite the high living expense. We love it here and want to spend the rest of our lives here. There's is nothing like SF. Misguided upzoning stands to benefit developers who are interested in short-term gains by building monstrosities in high real estate neighborhoods and making a quick profit, and not in helping provide affordable housing. There are plenty of empty buildings in the financial district, downtown and south of market. They can be re-purposed and refurbished. Please do not surrender the city to greed, to people who have little interest in the longterm well being of SF and our communities. Haven't we learned from the lessons of the past??

Sincerely,
Fadi Lakkis
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	mckeonsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan McKeon
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 26, 2025 9:12:05 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Susan McKeon
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: sfotrace@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tracy Fannin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 11:30:08 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):I am born and raised in the Lakeshore District of SF. My family also has very strong Sunset roots. I still live in the house that I grew up in and would like to keep it that way. I love my neighborhood and City very much. I do not want to see it destroyed by these policies that will make it harder for native San Franciscians to continue to live here and what makes each neighborhood unique. I also would like to live out my retirement here. We don't need a bunch of apartment buildings popping up in single family home neighborhoods. It just Isn't appropriate!! There are ways and other areas besides the West Side to add more housing, but this plan is definately not the right way to do it. There needs to be a more thoughtful approach. The City and Mayor also need to be pushing back on the State and telling them NO!!! Please reconsider this plan. Thank You..

Sincerely,
Tracy Fannin
San Francisco, CA 94132

From:	robert@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Caccia
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, July 24, 2025 1:46:13 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 longtime San Franciscan (born, raised, purchased our home on 76 Magnolia Street in 1993), I'm deeply concerned about Mayor Lurie's current plan. While I support smart growth, this proposal encourages the demolition of existing homes, displaces renters and small businesses, and risks turning our unique neighborhoods into rows of high-end high-rises that few can afford.

I respectfully urge you to:

- Significantly scale back the proposed upzoning maps
- Request a delay of the January 2026 upzoning deadline to allow for more thoughtful community input

The Mayor's plan would bring sweeping, permanent changes to our city's land use — going far beyond what's necessary, with no guarantees for affordability.

As it stands, this proposal seems to clear the path for widespread demolition and luxury development, putting developer interests above those of everyday San Franciscans. We deserve a city that values inclusive planning over displacement and truly reflects the needs of its communities.

Sincerely,
Robert Caccia
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: patscafesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Darden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Thursday, July 24, 2025 2:24:20 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised

We love San Francisco and feel that these high buildings are a monstrosity. I feel a 4 or 5 storied building would not distract from the charm of the city. Please please reconsider your plans.

Sincerely,
Patricia Darden
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	mkjanis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of janis kaempfe
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Friday, July 25, 2025 1:51:03 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a renter living in District 3 in San Francisco, I am adamantly against Mayor Lurie's irresponsible upzoning plan, which will encourage demolition of existing homes, displace renters and small businesses, and transform our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.
Therefore, I am urging you to: a) Significantly scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps, and b) - Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline to allow time for more reasonable considerations.
Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.
These plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.
This plan is one of the largest threats in the history of San Francisco to make it unaffordable for most of the San Franciscans who live and work here and have made this city the very attractive place it has become live and attract the many tourists that we depend on for our budget

Sincerely,
janis kaempfe
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jherrod9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Herrod-Lumsden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Friday, July 25, 2025 1:32:11 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: nsaldou37@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natalie Saldou
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 1:00:17 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- analyze population growth projections using more recent data as well as looking at housing data (sales, prices, time on market etc) holistically and specifically for SF
- postpone the Mayor's upzoning maps until this analysis is completed and shared publicly with time for commenting, understanding and alignment
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use with zero affordability guarantees. This proposal appears to serve the interests of developers and billionaire investors and not the communities they are supposed to serve.

Sincerely,
Natalie Saldou
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: rrng8@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith G
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 8:01:30 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Judith G
San Francisco, CA 94109

From:	mitzi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mitzi Johnson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Saturday, July 26, 2025 6:21:54 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Mitzi Johnson
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: dennehyc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cathi Dennehy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Sunday, July 27, 2025 8:56:11 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Cathi Dennehy
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	drgenemccoy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret McCoy
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Sunday, July 27, 2025 4:08:19 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Margaret McCoy
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: jlansing@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James Lansing
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, July 28, 2025 10:59:38 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
James Lansing
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	Rhys Sullivan
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS)
Cc:	MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Monday, July 28, 2025 1:06:45 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Melgar,

I'm a resident of District 7. I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing. We need to:

- Support Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan to allow more housing on the west side
- Allow taller buildings near transit stops and major corridors
- Streamline the permitting process to reduce delays and costs
- Stop letting a vocal minority of NIMBYs block housing that our city desperately needs

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco remains a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

From:	m.a.tovar@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maria Tovar
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Monday, July 28, 2025 4:58:50 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): in addition to the increase in density, there is no room for improving traffic and other infrastructure. The commute corridor from the freeway to the Marina is tapped out congested. A resounding NO!

Sincerely,
Maria Tovar
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: julie@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Giles
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 4:12:19 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displaces renters and small businesses, and threatens to transform our neighborhoods into corridors of unaffordable luxury high-rises.

We urge you to:

Significantly scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

These proposed changes would fundamentally alter the character of San Francisco. By promoting widespread demolition, the plan risks driving out the small businesses that give each neighborhood its unique identity and charm. It also threatens to replace historic architecture with generic modern buildings that could exist in any city.

Together, these policies pave the way for mass demolition and luxury development—serving the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the communities they claim to support. This is not thoughtful urban planning; it is displacement disguised as progress, and it will not solve our housing crisis.

Sincerely,
Julie Giles
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: npboley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nathan Boley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, July 30, 2025 5:03:52 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hi, I found this email form on Nextdoor asking us to oppose the zoning changes. I completely disagree and oppose this type of low-effort politics.

As a 20 year resident of San Francisco, a home owner, and a parent of 3 young children that I'm raising in a 2 bedroom TIC in North Beach I *strongly* support these changes.

Again, as a San Franciscan, I strongly support Mayor Lurie's plan.

We call on you to:

- Fully support the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Fulfill the January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would help to make the city affordable to working parents and families.

Thanks for your thoughts and consideration.

Sincerely,
Nathan Boley
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	mcdefries@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Melissa Seal
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Wednesday, July 30, 2025 6:13:59 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): If you've seen this done in other areas, you know will be lost with this upzoning. Please please please scale this back. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Melissa Seal
San Francisco, CA 94108

From: lu3mwls@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Hayashi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Wednesday, July 30, 2025 8:37:16 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Linda Hayashi
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	rbrandi
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	Mayor Zoning Plan Bad for Small Business
Date:	Thursday, July 31, 2025 10:30:17 AM
Attachments:	image.png image.png image.png image.png

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors recently introduced three proposals to “save” small businesses in the face of the Mayor’s upzoning plan that will demolish low rise small businesses. The point of the upzoing is to replace small businesses with high-rise mixed-use commercial and residential projects. However, experience shows that small commercial businesses DO NOT move into the new mixed use high rises projects. Take Upper Market. After more than 10 years none of the businesses are family-owned or open to the general public. There are only banks, gyms or medical clinics leaving 50% vacancies.



2175 Market built 2014. A gym, a walk-in clinic and vacant storefronts.



2200 Market built 2019. A bank and a vacant storefront.



1998 Market built 2014. Walk-in clinic, H&R block, and 3 vacant storefronts.

1844 Market built 2014. A bank, a gym, and vacant storefronts.

Developers don't care if the ground floors aren't leased as they can make their profit with the residential units. Everyone knows it so two members of the Board of Supervisor's recently introduced proposals to "save" small businesses. But the measures won't work.

1. Supervisor Melgar would offer grants and small loans to offset the added costs such as moving expenses after buildings have been demolished. This is a severance payment. A business might be able to afford and find a new place to set up shop once but they can't return to the neighborhood. Many will retire, or close. IN ANY CASE, THE NEIGHBORHOOD SERVING BUSINESSES IN THAT NEIGHBORHOOD WILL BE GONE FOR GOOD.

2. Supervisor Chan would continue oversight for official "legacy businesses" — those that have operated for 30 years or more. They only protection from demolition is approval from the Planning Commission. And there are only 427 legacy businesses out of 94,000 small businesses.

3. Chan's other measure would help employees to band together to purchase the business they work

for when the owner is looking to sell. This is a non sequitur, if the building is torn down, who cares who the new owner is?

The Mayor's upzoning plan is analogous to the displacement caused by urban renewal in the

1960s. Then the government bought property under eminent domain and resold it to developers. The property owners got pennies on the dollar and the tenants got nothing. Many neighborhoods were demolished and remained deserts for decades.

This time the government is upzoning the land, enriching the property owners while giving the tenants, i.e. small businesses, nothing. Under both urban renewal and the Mayor's plan the upheaval to people's lives, the destruction of businesses, and the hollowing out of neighborhoods is justified by the greater good. Urban renewal was justified as a *housing program*. Today, we have a small business demolition plan couched as a housing program, "Family Zoning Plan." The hope is that high-rise projects will produce a lot of housing. Experience shows the apartments or condos that are actually built are too small and too expensive for middle income families. The number of "affordable" units are too few to make a dent for low-income families. And there is nothing to prevent the loss of small businesses.

Before urban renewal was finally shut down, the government made relocation payments which were inadequate, just like the Board of Supervisors is proposing today. Please don't make the same mistake and destroy the neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Richard Brandi

From:	greta.alexander@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Greta Alexander
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, July 31, 2025 2:59:48 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Greta Alexander
San Francisco, CA 94111

From:	barbarajheffernan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Heffernan
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Thursday, July 31, 2025 3:03:55 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Barbara Heffernan
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	Jim Flanagan
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, August 2, 2025 11:54:21 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

From:	Bianca Dibartolo-Forrester
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+more-housing@growsf.org
Subject:	I support more housing (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Sunday, August 3, 2025 10:58:07 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for more housing in San Francisco, including Mayor Lurie's family zoning plan.

As polling consistently shows, the vast majority of San Francisco residents across all demographics support building more housing.

San Francisco is 90% behind on our state-mandated housing goals. If we don't act soon, the state will strip our city of local control over zoning and development. We must build more housing to address our affordability crisis and ensure San Francisco becomes a place where families can afford to live.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.
Bianca Forrester

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). It may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please alert the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message

From: zrants@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mari Eliza
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 4, 2025 8:04:36 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Mari Eliza
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: knit1purl1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of PATIENCE HUTCHINSON
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 4, 2025 8:15:18 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
PATIENCE HUTCHINSON
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: mail@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Josie Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Monday, August 4, 2025 9:17:09 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as "progress." In fact, allowing this will decimate low income housing since no percentage of units in the new buildings allocated for this.Why isn't that the case? Also, the heights allowed in this proposed plan will also take away all sight corridors and view vistas—the reason San Francisco is the world's number one tourist destination. Without our beautiful Victorians and Edwardians, we are as faceless as Houston and Atlanta. And taller buildings on our narrow streets will mean blocked streets even worse than they are now by delivery trucks.

Please vote to keep the narrower streets at their current zoned heights.

Sincerely,
Josie Brown
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: fhochschild@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Frances Hochschild
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:05:08 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I was born here and have lived here 60 years and it’s so disappointing to see this happening to my city. As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement.

Please please stop this craziness!!

Sincerely,
Frances Hochschild
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: sarahssung@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah Sung
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:07:25 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sarah Sung
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	litagent@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cherie Fehrman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:08:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ENOUGH! STOP PLEASE!

Sincerely,
Cherie Fehrman
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: morganspierce@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Morgan Pierce
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:08:52 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco Business Owner, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Morgan Pierce
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: sptsantilis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Senta Tsantilis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:11:20 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Senta Tsantilis

From:	dede.estey@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dede Estey
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:11:28 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional particular concern along Fulton facing Golden Gate Park as many beautiful old homes from Edwardian times and single family residents would be demolished leaving ugly cookie cutter boxes in their place along with local residents with high costs to rent or afford to buy. In the Richmond District.):

Sincerely,
Dede Estey
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: rbrandi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Brandi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:12:27 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): we all know this plan will destroy small neighborhood businesses witness the small business commission action and 2 board of supervisors proposals but nothing is in the plan to save our neighborhoods. This is most reckless land use dictat of the state and we must fight it in the courts if necessary. Call weiners buff.

Sincerely,
Richard Brandi

From: damianinglin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Damian Inglin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:32:47 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I STRONGLY oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): There is no need for additional housing in San Francisco. This push for housing is gaslighting. Stop the destruction of San Francisco!

Sincerely,
Damian Inglin
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	okeeffengc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Norma OKeeffe
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:36:50 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Norma OKeeffe
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: films@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Irving
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:42:33 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

To Mayor Lurie: Going forward, do you want to be the mayor who is blamed for demolishing the city that residents and tourists love? Or would you prefer to be remembered as the mayor who pushed back against the State's takeover of our planning and zoning process? As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose your plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and the transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on our elected and appointed representatives to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Demand a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

The upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Don't buy into it. You will be sorry if you do.

Sincerely,
Judy Irving
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	barbarajheffernan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Heffernan
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:46:54 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Barbara Heffernan
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	epoole@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Edward Poole
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:49:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

AS a resicent of Cow Hollow, I could not be more upset at this prospect. Way to ruin the neighborhood feel of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Edward Poole
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	cadamb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brendan Cadam
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:49:45 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan and bayview resident, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing, and transformation of our neighborhoods into mismatched high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use and skyline — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Brendan Cadam
San Francisco, CA 94124

From: john33sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:50:13 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94142

From:	madatian.j@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jasmine Madatian
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:52:23 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is designed to create chaos for residents of this once beautiful city.

Sincerely,
Jasmine Madatian
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: yelsoma@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Mosley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 11:57:12 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, downgrades architectual preservation, and can transform our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

Use the power of your office to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Alice Mosley
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: diana.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of DIANA GIAMPAOLI
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:02:43 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Danie Lurie is backed by construction companies/workers. This is not bringing affordable housing. It is making the construction industry richer and ruining our city. THERE IS PLENTY OF HOUSING SITTING VACANT. STOP GETTING DEVELOPERS RICHER.

Sincerely,
DIANA GIAMPAOLI
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	danolley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Nolley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:20:51 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 long-time San Franciscan (BA SFSU '68), I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. My wife and I call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps; and
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline.

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees. Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition as well as luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
David Nolley
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: audreyrbjorklund@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Audrey Bjorklund
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:28:55 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

These plans will ruin the flavor and personality of San Francisco and what makes it a special and wonderful city to live in. DO not destroy the beauty of our city for the sake profit and those who don't care about its future or the people and neighborhoods that make it all it is.

Sincerely,
Audrey Bjorklund
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	beckyfchristian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Becky Christian
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:29:18 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Becky Christian
San Francisco, CA 94123

From:	chamaret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jun Ishimuro
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:31:45 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jun Ishimuro
San Francisco, CA 94114

From:	noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:36:44 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I do not want the Westside of SF overbuilt.

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:38:27 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	aschuppek@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Angelique Schuppek
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:42:36 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
The reason people come to visit and live in SF is because of the beautiful and historic neighborhoods like North Beach. Please reject the upzoning of North Beach!

Sincerely,
Angelique Schuppek
San Francisco, CA 94133

From:	pattired12@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patti McMahon
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:46:39 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS):I think the first priority in new housing is dealing with empty office buildings in downtown. New homes in this area will bring more activity and improve business. The height on Lombard, Geary of 11 stories is crazy. I think empty buildings and lots should be built up but max height 5-6 floors. I’ve owned my property for years but this could adversely impact neighbors who have recently purchased their properties.

Sincerely,
Patti McMahon
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: justintruong56@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:47:42 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Justin Truong

From: andreacgalvin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrea Galvin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701]
Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 12:53:48 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 San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):
I am a longtime resident of the Richmond District and am profoundly disgusted and disillusioned by the idea that a few out of touch politicians with no familiarity with, let alone appreciation for, my neighborhood are about to circumvent the democratic process, exclude community input, and sell out my neighborhood to real estate developers and billionaire tech interests who fund Sen. Weiner and apparently Mayor Lurie as well. There has been a lot of concern in recent years about threats to democracy. I share that concern. One of the biggest threats to democracy I see comes in the form of greedy land speculators hiding behind the language of "Abundance." Mayor Lurie's proposed blanket upzoning plan will result in major and irreversible changes to the character of our city. We must not rush to approve something with such major impact. Please take the time to consider the second order effects (e.g. displacement of businesses and long-term renters, greater traffic congestion, decreased quality of life for existing residents, loss of the unique character of our city.) What is the rush? Who benefits?

I am also the parent of young college graduates, native San Franciscans who are moving back to the city to start their careers and currently in the process of navigating the rental market. I am not removed from their challenges; and even so I question the need for massive upzoning. The young San Franciscans I know - as opposed to the Astro-turf YIMBY activists who are few but make a lot of noise - want nothing to do with the homogenized, soul-less, cheaply constructed schlock that this blanket, indiscriminate upzoning proposal will yield - with no accountability for developers and no guarantee of actual affordability.

Sincerely,
Andrea Galvin
San Francisco, CA 94121

Item 59

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)
Subject:	SFPD recruitment policies - 16 letters
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:06:00 PM
Attachments:	16 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 16 letters from members of the public regarding San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) recruitment policies.

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:	John R Manning
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, July 26, 2025 10:29:40 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I’m writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco’s Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/

Thank you!
John R. Manning
mobile 415-828-4736

From:	Chauncey DiLaura
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, July 26, 2025 11:12:51 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers

- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/

Thank you!

From:	Sam Pollock
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, July 26, 2025 11:23:38 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I’m writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco’s Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/

Thank you!

From: Lesley Tannahill
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject: Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 11:55:36 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo2YjBlZGQ3ZDhmYzI4NjYxNTNlMGE4NWYwMGNlYjBmMTo3OmI4OWM6ODY0ZTc3ZGI4ZmU0YTVkM2IxYTFkNTUxNjljMWI0M2ZlODZkMzkxYTgxMGE4OTljMTM3NDM3OGMyMmRmMmFmODpwOlQ6Tg

Thank you!

Sent from my iPad

From: Patricia Stanton
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject: Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 12:30:20 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://urldefense.com/v3/__https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/__;!!XXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiYzQxYzU0MTQ0NDVlZWM4NzU3YmU5Mjk2Y2FiM2ZmNDo3OmVlOTY6NTZjMGFkMzJmMTlkMTk1YjFhZTU3MmI0ZDhkYjY1YzgyOTQwNjZkYzhhNzJiM2JmM2UxMGUyNWU4YTA5OTM4ODpwOkY6Tg

Thank you!

Pat

From: Cory Jircitano
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject: Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 1:48:10 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpkMDNlZGQ0YTI4OWVhYWQxM2U3MTlhYjE2Y2MzMjI3MTo3OjY5OTQ6Njg1ODE2NTI5MmU5MzhiOGRkMTA3Y2U3MTVkZTI5OWY0YjUyMWU1NDc0MzhjYWViMWI0MDNlZTExNGFmMDhlZDpwOkY6Tg

Thank you!

Sent from my iPhone

From: Bev Sutton
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject: Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 1:58:53 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo3YjZiMDE5ZGZjMDg1OWJjOWM5NDk0MDBkZDAwODY5Mzo3OmM0ODU6YzEzNGRkNTk5MTU1MjViOGMyNDIxODRjMzdmMDE5MDlmYmFkNDc2NDM4ZjU2MjA0NDNkZDVkOGZiNTI2Nzl0NTpwOlQ6Tg

Thank you!

From: Peter B Jarrett
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject: Let's Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 3:19:23 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo4ODlmMmVmN2Y5ZGYwNmE0YWJkOTJiMjM4MDcxZmMyNTo3OmE0OTI6ZTYzMGQzNzkyMTQwMDQ1YWZhYTRlYWYwNGJlNDRmMGQzYzE2MmYxZGViZWY5YmUxMmJjZWRkNmNlOTc2NjMyODp0OkY6Tg

Thank you!

From: Mahdi Rahimi
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject: Let's Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 3:27:48 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo0MDQyYTMyMGU5NzJkOWUzYzJkZmI3MDQ2OWJmZTYxNTo3OjM4ODM6OTA0MzU4YTljMjI5Yjk3NGFjYzhlODFlNTVkMjI5YjQ0NzRiYmNiYTZlYTUzMjVlZTYyZjIjYTRiNmJmODdkYzpwOkY6Tg

Thank you!

Mahdi Rahimi

From:	David Thomas
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, July 26, 2025 4:14:14 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

All the items listed below, but even more important to show appreciation and respect for law enforcement and the incredibly difficult job they are required to do. This as opposed to the insanity of ideas such as "defund the police " so in vogue in the recent past, which is the prime cause of the disastrous situation that presently exists in San Francisco.

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpmOTdhYzNkYmFjNGIzMTUzMzczMjNmMWM3YmNkYWI5Yjo3OjA1MDY6M2JlZjNlNGJkYmY4ZDE4ZGQ5YmY2YjhjZjMwOGY3Yzk3ZmE4YWFlZGRjYjA2ZjZiNDRiN2UyMmM5MzNjNjYyNDpwOkY6Tg

Thank you!

David Thomas

From:	Stephen Voris
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	Let's Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, July 26, 2025 8:24:19 PM

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

S.F. Supervisors-

We need safer streets, particularly for seniors and children!

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo4NDFlMjc4MmI2Y2E2ZDNhNzgwNjhhZmQ1YzNiNWMwNDo3OmU2NWE6Y2E3ZDQwZGU5ZTE3MWJiNjJiOTg1YjcwZmIzYjdkMTFiNDQ0MzNjZGFjNGVmNDhiNDYyZTgzODBiNTgwNWJlMDpwOlQ6Tg

Thank you!
Stephen Voris

Sent from my iPhone

From: Donald Graves
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject: Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 8:25:34 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiNjZhZDYxNTVhNzEyYjU1NTk1YTg3MWO4N2O4Nzg2ODo3OmUwZTU6YmU4NGQ1YTNhMmVkZGYzOTBkNWNjNDVhMTEyYjBjZjQ3ZDMzYzFiNjQ1NDQ2ZTVhMDIxNGUzODBmNWQyNGE5NDpwOkY6Tg

Thank you!

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Emily McDonnell
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, July 26, 2025 10:03:19 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I’m writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco’s Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/

Thank you!
Emily McDonnell
94110

From: Annette Billingsley
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject: Let's Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date: Sunday, July 27, 2025 5:46:36 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo3ZmM2OTA4MGU4M2MwZDA2NDM3NzhhYTMwN2I4MzJjNTo3OjIwZGI6MjA3NGM3YTI3MWU2ZTRiMjg5MWMxNjBlZDNlMDY5NDFlNTdmYjM3ODYyOTk4ZWVkMTA1ODkyYjRkYWZlNjE2YjpwOkY6Tg

Thank you!

Sent from my iPad

From:	Philip Claudy Fleischman
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Sunday, July 27, 2025 2:47:59 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I’m writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco’s Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/

Thank you!

From: hatfield.jennie@icloud.com
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject: Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 6:58:24 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzplNzgwMTkzNjk1NGNiODRmYzE0Njk3YzQ4ZTkzNmY2ODo3OmIzMzE6MmZkNmI0MmU3YTE3NWRiYThlZjBmOThlYzNhZDkwNTZjMzRhYWNmY2M2MWNiOWY2ZDg0NWIyZjIyYTEmOTAzNzpwOlQ6Tg

Thank you!
Jennie Herriot-Hatfield
Miraloma Park

Sent from my mobile device

Item 60

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)
Subject:	FW: Crocker Amazon playing fields renovation
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 1:12:10 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from David Romano regarding the use of plastic turf in the renovation of the Crocker Amazon baseball fields.

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: David Romano <droma4@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 7, 2025 4:12 PM
To: Commission, Recpark (REC) <recpark.commission@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mauer, Dan (REC) <dan.mauer@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Subject: Crocker Amazon playing fields renovation

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

Dear Commissioners and Supervisors:

Here is the latest bad news on artificial turf.

> Negotiations are underway in Geneva on a legally binding Global Plastics Treaty that has been in the works for several years, as the crisis of pollution from plastics worldwide has grown more acute. An estimated 8 billion metric tons of plastic waste now pollute the planet. Without changes, the production of plastic is expected to triple by 2060 — much of it driven by single-use plastics.
>
> This comes as a new report by *The Lancet* has found that plastics are a "grave threat" to human health. "Waste plastic contains thousands of toxic chemicals that cause human exposure and result in disease and disability and premature death," says Dr. Philip Landrigan, an author of the report and the director of the Global Observatory on Planetary Health at Boston College. He also notes that **plastic is especially harmful to children, who are at risk for "decreased IQ, injury to the reproductive organs" and liver damage when exposed to plastics during early development**. - Democracy Now, August 7, 2025

David Romano

San Francisco CA

Item 61

From:	Lagunte, Richard (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); Crayton, Monique (BOS)
Subject:	File No. 250639 - 246 Letters
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:21:39 PM
Attachments:	246 Letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 246 letters from members of the public regarding:

> File No. 250639 - Resolution urging the Police Department and the Department of Emergency Management to designate all 911 calls reporting drug use or suspected drug activity within 1,500 feet of parks, playgrounds, and schools as “Priority A” calls requiring swift and immediate response.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board – Operations Division
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-7709 | Fax (415) 554-5163
richard.lagunte@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: Calum MacKay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 5:36:30 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: Calum MacKay

Email: calumlmackay@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Karina Velasquez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 6:02:26 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: Karina Velasquez

Email: karinawinder@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Tiffany Waugh
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 6:45:33 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	Tiffany Waugh
Email	tiffanyparalta@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Sara Ropeke
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 6:54:21 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: Sara Ropeke

Email: saraanneroepke@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Jay Yang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 7:41:29 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: Jay Yang

Email: jnyang14@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: barbara spalding
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 9:45:24 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	barbara spalding
Email	barbaramail07@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Ronald Mungai
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Saturday, August 2, 2025 3:19:28 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	Ronald Mungai
Email	limo4usf@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Iris Bucchioni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Saturday, August 2, 2025 10:20:24 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	Iris Bucchioni
Email	irismvbucchioni@yahoo.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety. Iris Bucchioni

From: Vera Genkin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Saturday, August 2, 2025 10:20:27 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	Vera Genkin
Email	tuttgen@sonic.net
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Kristap Baltin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Saturday, August 2, 2025 8:03:26 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: Kristap Baltin

Email: kbaltin@yahoo.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Marina Dee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Saturday, August 2, 2025 9:02:02 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	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Richard Adhikari
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Sunday, August 3, 2025 12:42:20 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	Richard Adhikari
Email	planner.filler-6r@icloud.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: K R
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Monday, August 4, 2025 1:03:52 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 R

Email: kos.noemail@neverbox.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: pamela smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Monday, August 4, 2025 2:09:31 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: pamela smith

Email: pamontherun@yahoo.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

Pamela Smith

From: Morgan Weiss
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Monday, August 4, 2025 5:04:42 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: Morgan Weiss

Email: manduin@pacbell.net

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

Make it a law! Put it on the ballot! Please make the safety of San Francisco's children a TOP priority!

From: Jason jungreis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 1:35:21 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	Jason jungreis
Email	jasonjungreis@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Sarah Anderson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 5:16:30 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	Sarah Anderson
Email	sandersonsf@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Martha Ehmann Conte
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 8:18:36 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: Martha Ehmann Conte

Email: martha@ehmannconte.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Daphne Alden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Sunday, August 10, 2025 9:51:32 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	Daphne Alden
Email	daphne.alden@me.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Amy Carr
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Monday, August 11, 2025 12:41:25 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: Amy Carr

Email: amy.grossi.carr@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Kimberly Karp
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Monday, August 11, 2025 7:16:34 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: Kimberly Karp

Email: kim@kkpromos.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Tony Fox
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Monday, August 11, 2025 8:41:26 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	Tony Fox
Email	sftonyfox@yahoo.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: barbara spalding
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 9:42:26 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	barbara spalding
Email	bspalding625@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Ken Capelli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:05:32 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	Ken Capelli
Email	kencapelli@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Griffin Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:09:19 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: Griffin Lee

Email: griffin.gregory.lee@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: juan ortiz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:05:41 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	juan ortiz
Email	juanandreyortiz@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Curtis Gardner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:33:30 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: Curtis Gardner

Email: cgardner@jspllc.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Jeanne Angier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:38:24 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	Jeanne Angier
Email	jay.dong.tcm1@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Roberta Economidis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:38:28 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: Roberta Economidis

Email: reconomidis@yahoo.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Caroline Matthews
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:39:38 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: Caroline Matthews

Email: carolinem_matthews@yahoo.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Jeffrey Yeung
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:41:34 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: Jeffrey Yeung

Email: jdyeung@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Yedi Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:42:27 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: Yedi Wong

Email: wongye@yahoo.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Marion Novasic
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:43:34 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: Marion Novasic

Email: mn20001@hotmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: John Owl
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:46:32 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: John Owl

Email: phnxextant2.0@yahoo.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Drug addicts and drug sellers are sociopaths without morals or ethics. They do not care if children are hurt by their actions. Please keep the innocents safe to learn and grow up.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Renee Lazear
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:47:23 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: Renee Lazear

Email: redpl@aol.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Jeremiah Boehner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:47:29 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: Jeremiah Boehner

Email: jeremiahboehner@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Hessah Aljiran
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:47:40 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	Hessah Aljiran
Email	hessah.aljiran@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:47:40 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	SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF
Email	info@sonsf.org
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Ted Manahan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:49:27 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	Ted Manahan
Email	theodore.manahan@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Sunny Evans
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:49:52 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	Sunny Evans
Email	sunny.evans23@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Donya Fahmy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:50:32 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	Donya Fahmy
Email	aromagal@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Jack Downing
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:50:35 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: Jack Downing

Email: majorjackdowning@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Scott Jacques
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:51:36 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: Scott Jacques

Email: scottjacques@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Mainul Mondal
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:51:41 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	Mainul Mondal
Email	islam.mainul@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Susan Wolff
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:51:41 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: Susan Wolff

Email: SunRose7818@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Brad McMillan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:52:26 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: Brad McMillan

Email: mcmillan@viselect.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Holly Peterson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:53:40 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	Holly Peterson
Email	holly.peterson@me.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Marilyn Morgan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:56:28 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: Marilyn Morgan

Email: marilynmorgan@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Stephen Gorski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:58:25 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: Stephen Gorski

Email: sjgorskilaw@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Michael Barker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:58:32 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: Michael Barker

Email: mbarker@shea-co.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety,

Michael S. Barker
2027 Jefferson Street
San Francisco, CA 94123
San Francisco Taxpayer Since 1995

From: Adrienne Hoyer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:58:32 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: Adrienne Hoyer

Email: amhoyer@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Laura Lin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:59:29 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: Laura Lin

Email: lllin2030@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:59:33 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	Justin Truong
Email	justintruong56@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Johanna Sanders
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:00:46 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	Johanna Sanders
Email	joh.highway.sanders@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Christina Quiroz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:04:41 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	Christina Quiroz
Email	quirozc@sfusd.edu
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: John Hurabiell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:08:42 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 Hurabiell

Email: Lotusman@pacbell.net

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Susan Cerce
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:14:26 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: Susan Cerce

Email: SCerce@yahoo.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Mark E. Sackett
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:14:26 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: Mark E. Sackett

Email: msackett@theboxsf.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Marjorie Fulbright
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:17:38 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	Marjorie Fulbright
Email	fulbrightm@yahoo.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Cornell Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:23:37 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	Cornell Lee
Email	corny1215@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: marina franco
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:35:35 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	marina franco
Email	marinarfranco@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Usha and John Burns
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:39:31 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	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: John Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:43:29 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: John Nulty

Email: john.nulty@yahoo.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Mark Fabela
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:44:23 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: Mark Fabela

Email: markdfabela@yahoo.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Leslie Huang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:44:29 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: Leslie Huang

Email: leslie94117@yahoo.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: PETER LOGAN
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:46:32 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	PETER LOGAN
Email	peter@peterloganlaw.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Amy Murphy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:48:23 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: Amy Murphy

Email: ammurphy1@dons.usfca.edu

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Ruth Parker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 1:03:29 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: Ruth Parker

Email: rsparker@mail.sfsu.edu

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: David Soffa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 1:11:36 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: David Soffa

Email: soffad@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Bernard Thomas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 1:12:33 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: Bernard Thomas

Email: bsthomas@ix.netcom.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Michelle Wing
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 1:19:31 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: Michelle Wing

Email: michelle@itsyogakids.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

Sincerely, Michelle Wing

From: Elizabeth Clark
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 1:30:35 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	Elizabeth Clark
Email	swimeclark@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Calum Mackay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 1:31:32 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	Calum Mackay
Email	calumlmackay@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Stanley Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 1:41:28 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: Stanley Wong

Email: Swong3028@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Gnarity Burke
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 1:42:33 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	Gnarity Burke
Email	urban42n81@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Judith Wall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 1:49:45 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: Judith Wall

Email: judithwallsf@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Linda Crist
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 2:09:52 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: Linda Crist

Email: sfcalgal@hotmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Ronald Albucher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 2:13:25 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 Albucher

Email: ronalbucher@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Erin Boylan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 2:27:34 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	Erin Boylan
Email	ekbcelt@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Shirley Fogarino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 2:29:31 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	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. Add to this child care centers. In the area where we live, drug deals happen within 30 feet of two child care centers! I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Jane Perry
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 2:34:29 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: Jane Perry

Email: janesjoint5@comcast.net

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Bev Sutton
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 2:37:28 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	Bev Sutton
Email	bev_sutton@yahoo.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Hatun Noguera Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 2:56:25 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	Hatun Noguera Hatun Noguera
Email	noguera@changes.world
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Firas Bukhari
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 2:59:28 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	Firas Bukhari
Email	firasbukhari@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety. Sincerely, Firas Bukhari

From: Judi Hurabiell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 3:04:30 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	Judi Hurabiell
Email	jmhurabiell1@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Laurance Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 3:18:34 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: Laurance Lee

Email: laulemlee@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

Laurance Lee

From: Ansel Wettersten
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 3:27:49 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: Ansel Wettersten

Email: awawd@mac.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Maria Nowicki
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 3:35:11 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	Maria Nowicki
Email	mnowicki45@yahoo.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Giovanni Torre
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 3:49:32 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	Giovanni Torre
Email	pulses_glands0s@icloud.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Ken Vanos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 3:55:22 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: Ken Vanos

Email: kenvanos@yahoo.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Michael Dorf
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 4:11:17 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: Michael Dorf

Email: michael_dorf@comcast.net

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Bianca Molgora
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 4:16:26 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: Bianca Molgora

Email: biancamsf@yahoo.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Bryan McNally
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 4:20:29 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	Bryan McNally
Email	qmacker@yahoo.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Lynne Sloan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 4:46:33 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	Lynne Sloan
Email	lynnesloan@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Susan Mackowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 5:08:28 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 Mackowski

Email: susanmackowski@gmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: JEFFREY NIGH
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 5:36:37 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 JEFFREY NIGH

Email JANIGH@COMCAST.NET

Subject Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: JOHN CERVANTES
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 6:03:25 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: JOHN CERVANTES

Email: city10s@pacbell.net

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Diann Rose
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 6:33:27 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: Diann Rose

Email: diannrose@yahoo.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Nina Block
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 6:58:25 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: Nina Block

Email: lemon.dolores@yahoo.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: J. Barry Gurdin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 7:43:28 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: J. Barry Gurdin

Email: gurdin@hotmail.com

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Andrew Nadell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 7:43:29 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	Andrew Nadell
Email	caius@caius.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Helen McClure
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 7:54:26 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: Helen McClure

Email: helen@castrocbd.org

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Dennis Ainslie
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 8:02:28 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	Dennis Ainslie
Email	dmainsl@yahoo.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Sharon Soong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 8:45:29 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	Sharon Soong
Email	soong.sharon@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Judi Gorski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 8:46:23 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	Judi Gorski
Email	judigorski@gmail.com
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Edward Sullivan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 9:51:26 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Edward Sullivan
Email	efsullyjr@aol.com
District	D4
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Jennifer Z Yan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 9:53:30 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Jennifer Z Yan
Email	popcorn-kidder.3s@icloud.com
District	D2
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Christine Peterson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 10:31:30 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Christine Peterson

Email: christinepeterson194@gmail.com

District: D11

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Johanna Ruiz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:01:30 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Johanna Ruiz

Email: luna1405@hotmail.com

District: D4

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Lina Batshon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:30:54 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Lina Batshon

Email: linafad@gmail.com

District: D6

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Josephine Chew
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 11:49:26 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Josephine Chew

Email: josephine.chew@gmail.com

District: D4

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Gloria Arcelona
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 7:15:32 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Gloria Arcelona

Email: gaicardo@gmail.com

District: D1

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Karan Mamaniya
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 8:14:27 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Karan Mamaniya
Email	kmamaniya@gmail.com
District	D6
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Eric Rozell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 8:53:32 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Eric Rozell
Email	ericrozell@yahoo.com
District	D5
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Nancy Nancy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 9:28:28 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Nancy Nancy
Email	nlfederico@msn.com
District	D4
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Suzie Chow
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 10:50:37 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Suzie Chow
Email	nodaev@yahoo.com
District	D4
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Diane Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 11:24:34 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Diane Smith
Email	bvhprealtors@comcast.net
District	D10
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Kate English
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 11:46:27 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Kate English

Email: kenglish1775@comcast.net

District: D1

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Michael Larsen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 11:54:32 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Michael Larsen
Email	epml@aol.com
District	D3
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: pamela smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 12:19:34 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: pamela smith

Email: pamontherun@yahoo.com

District: D5

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: David Nolley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 2:38:31 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	David Nolley
Email	danolley@aol.com
District	D4
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I’m representing my wife as well as myself in writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as “Priority A.” This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families from the unseemly activities of humans who clearly don't care about themselves as well as vulnerable children who don't need those maladaptive examples thrown in their faces. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be "normalized" as by simply leaving it open to view. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. My wife and I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Senta Tsantilis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 5:41:24 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Senta Tsantilis
Email	sptsantilis@gmail.com
District	D4
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Jim Bertana
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 10:11:23 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Jim Bertana
Email	jimbertana@icloud.com
District	D6
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Charlotte Worcester
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2025 10:48:18 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Charlotte Worcester

Email: beaubarlotte@yahoo.com

District: D8

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. The fact that we are even needing to request this is absurd and a sign that the City is in deep need of reprioritizing for our children. Make this more than a resolution.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Dennis Tsai
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, August 15, 2025 12:51:38 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Dennis Tsai
Email	dtsai6277@aol.com
District	D4
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Charles Farrugia
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; DorseyStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, August 15, 2025 9:08:33 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Charles Farrugia

Email: helpmlpark@gmail.com

District: D11

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

Charles Farrugia
President - Help McLaren Park Group
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___www.helpmclarenpark.org___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo0ZDM4YjczMTZlMmQ1YTE2YzNjOWJkY2M1ZmJhY2I5Mzo3Ojk3NDA6MmIyNWYwM2M5ZWNiZmE0OTIkM2M2YWNjMmRhYmM4MDUyYzdhOWQ5ZTZiMDQxOGZiM2E4OTIxM2JkNzkzZmNhOTp0OlQ6Tg
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___www.helpmlpark.weebly.com___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo0ZDM4YjczMTZlMmQ1YTE2YzNjOWJkY2M1ZmJhY2I5Mzo3OjAyZTY6YWIxZDExOTI0ZTcwMTVjMTk2M2Y2YzI2MDQyYzYwOWMzNzQ4YWU2NjlkZTYwNGMxMTJkZjQ5Mjp0OlQ6Tg

From: Remi Tan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, August 15, 2025 11:45:36 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Remi Tan
Email	remitan@sbcglobal.net
District	D5
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Ronald Mungai
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, August 15, 2025 12:53:25 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Ronald Mungai
Email	limo4usf@gmail.com
District	D3
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Denise Foley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, August 15, 2025 1:33:28 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Denise Foley

Email: denisemrf79@gmail.com

District: D7

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From:	Karim
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Karim; Mira Haddad
Subject:	Prioritizing 911 calls. near schools,
Date:	Saturday, August 16, 2025 3:53:56 PM

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

Greetings SF Board of Supervisors,

As I understand it there is a piece of legislation being discussed regarding prioritizing 911 calls near schools. As an SF home owner and someone who also works in the city this is a great idea. My 2 children go to the International school on Oak. Only until the mayor started, that area was rampant with drug use and sales. I drove by it every day. This is not the environment to raise children in. Please prioritize the 911 calls near schools.

Karim & Mira El-Katcha
223 Molimo Drive
SF 94127

From: John Hurabiell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Monday, August 18, 2025 2:45:31 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: John Hurabiell

Email: Lotusman@pacbell.net

District: D1

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

Protect our kids not the miscreants.

From: Karim ELKatcha
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Monday, August 18, 2025 5:55:21 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Karim ELKatcha
Email	kelkatcha@gmail.com
District	D7
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Usha and John Burns
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:01:28 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Usha and John Burns

Email: johnmburns48@yahoo.com

District: D2

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Betsy Blumenthal
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:04:21 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Betsy Blumenthal
Email	bsq1028@gmail.com
District	D1
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Jane Day
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:05:36 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Jane Day
Email	janeday@earthlink.net
District	D6
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Dave English
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:06:29 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Dave English
Email	cobweb_isle0r@icloud.com
District	D1
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: MARGARET O"DRISCOLL
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:06:29 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	MARGARET O'DRISCOLL
Email	margaret@mission-properties.com
District	D7
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Pamela Lim
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:07:15 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Pamela Lim

Email: pamlim1129@yahoo.com

District: D1

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: PETER LOGAN
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:08:24 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	PETER LOGAN
Email	peter@peterloganlaw.com
District	D2
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Gang Li
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:09:34 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Gang Li

Email: fyjz2011@gmail.com

District: D6

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Lijun Ma
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:10:25 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Lijun Ma

Email: lijunma2001@yahoo.com

District: D4

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Joe Maloney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:11:31 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Joe Maloney

Email: joemaloneyjoe@gmail.com

District: D5

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Dimitrios Florakis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:12:25 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Dimitrios Florakis

Email: dimitriosflorakis@gmail.com

District: D5

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Larry Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:12:26 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Larry Lee

Email: lawrencelsf49@gmail.com

District: D4

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Jacqueline Murphy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:12:35 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Jacqueline Murphy

Email: jaxsonbrwn@yahoo.com

District: D2

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Biana Roykh
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:14:20 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Biana Roykh
Email	biana27@yahoo.com
District	D3
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Martha Ehmann Conte
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:15:20 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Martha Ehmann Conte
Email	martha@ehmannconte.com
District	D2
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Peter Rapier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:16:34 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Peter Rapier

Email: peter.rapier@gmail.com

District: D1

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Sherial Heller
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:17:22 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Sherial Heller

Email: Sherialh@sbcglobal.net

District: D3

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: J. Barry Gurdin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:17:33 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	J. Barry Gurdin
Email	gurdin@hotmail.com
District	D7
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Tony Mai
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:18:25 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Tony Mai

Email: tonylmai@gmail.com

District: D1

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Brad McMillan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:19:26 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Brad McMillan
Email	mcmillan@viselect.com
District	D2
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Newton Butler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:24:29 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Newton Butler

Email: Louissf@yahoo.com

District: D6

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Courtney Klinge
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:28:35 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Courtney Klinge

Email: Cklinge@yahoo.com

District: D3

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Carol Lawson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:34:26 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Carol Lawson

Email: crates.01.epics@icloud.com

District: D4

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Aaron Keith Long
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:35:26 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Aaron Keith Long
Email	aharon0689@gmail.com
District	D7
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: William Moore
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:40:28 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	William Moore
Email	BillGMoore@Yahoo.com
District	D8
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety. let me be specifically clear: You were elected to serve us the citizens of San Francisco, not to promote your personal agendas or

pad your bank accounts all while the quality of life here gets untenable and unlivable, you took an oath of office to make the city better, and clean it up, deal with the homeless and the filth that makes some places biohazards. That said we are tired of dealing with drugged out junkies crashed out on our streets, city parks and near or on school grounds. If you don't take this seriously, you can and will be voted out of office. San Francisco has become one huge CRAPHOLE under the liberals and the residents here are finally smartening up, they're tired of paying some of the highest taxes and fees and living in 3rd world conditions. take this seriously. I'm a native, come from a family who arrived for the gold rush, survived the 1906 earthquake and if alive today wouldn't recognize the one time California jewel that wasonce run by people with common sense and fiscal prudence that has deteriorated in many pleces to 3rd world conditions.

From: Karen Melander
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:42:21 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Karen Melander

Email: karenjoymelander@yahoo.com

District: D1

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Rita Fahrner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:42:29 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Rita Fahrner

Email: ritakell@comcast.net

District: D9

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Hatun Noguera Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:50:27 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Hatun Noguera Hatun Noguera
Email	noguera@changes.world
District	D7
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Judi Hurabiell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:50:33 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Judi Hurabiell
Email	jmhurabiell1@gmail.com
District	D1
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Diana Kaytun
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:53:28 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Diana Kaytun

Email: corex123@gmail.com

District: D1

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Carla Schlemminger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:58:23 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Carla Schlemminger

Email: carlas@yahoo.com

District: D2

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: John Lozynsky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 9:16:51 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: John Lozynsky

Email: johnlozy@yahoo.com

District: D3

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Stephen Gorski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 9:29:32 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Stephen Gorski
Email	sjgorskilaw@gmail.com
District	D4
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Vincent Louie
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 9:39:29 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Vincent Louie

Email: vlouie@cscpsv.org

District: D1

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Hieu Pham
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 9:42:37 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Hieu Pham

Email: hphamsf@gmail.com

District: D5

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Griffin Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 9:46:28 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Griffin Lee

Email: griffin.gregory.lee@gmail.com

District: D2

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Okko Grippando
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 9:55:28 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Okko Grippando
Email	grippo@gmail.com
District	D8
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Robin Azevedo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 9:56:24 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Robin Azevedo
Email	robin.azevedo@1687msi.com
District	D7
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Robin Azevedo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 9:56:24 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Robin Azevedo
Email	robin.azevedo@1687msi.com
District	D7
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Tami Epstein
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:02:23 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Tami Epstein

Email: tl.epstein@yahoo.com

District: D7

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Tami Epstein
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:02:23 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Tami Epstein

Email: tl.epstein@yahoo.com

District: D7

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Christine Peterson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:04:15 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Christine Peterson

Email: christinepeterson194@gmail.com

District: D3

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Christine Peterson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:04:15 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Christine Peterson

Email: christinepeterson194@gmail.com

District: D3

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Judi Gorski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:06:17 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Judi Gorski
Email	judigorski@gmail.com
District	D4
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Judi Gorski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:06:17 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Judi Gorski
Email	judigorski@gmail.com
District	D4
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Bev Lips
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:17:36 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Bev Lips

Email: buzbev@gmail.com

District: D1

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Bev Lips
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:17:36 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Bev Lips

Email: buzbev@gmail.com

District: D1

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Amy Murphy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:30:29 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Amy Murphy

Email: ammurphy1@dons.usfca.edu

District: D7

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Amy Murphy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:30:29 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Amy Murphy

Email: ammurphy1@dons.usfca.edu

District: D7

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Karen Breslin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:46:29 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Karen Breslin

Email: kbsmail@sbcglobal.net

District: D7

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Karen Breslin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:46:29 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Karen Breslin

Email: kbsmail@sbcglobal.net

District: D7

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 11:25:24 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Justin Truong
Email	justintruong56@gmail.com
District	D11
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 11:25:24 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Justin Truong
Email	justintruong56@gmail.com
District	D11
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Felicia Valmonte
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 11:34:38 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Felicia Valmonte

Email: feliciav@sbcglobal.net

District: D7

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Felicia Valmonte
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 11:34:38 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Felicia Valmonte

Email: feliciav@sbcglobal.net

District: D7

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Ana Nunez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 11:35:33 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Ana Nunez

Email: anaisgoogling@gmail.com

District: D11

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Ana Nunez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 11:35:33 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Ana Nunez

Email: anaisgoogling@gmail.com

District: D11

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Richard Adhikari
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 1:00:42 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Richard Adhikari

Email: planner.filler-6r@icloud.com

District: D11

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

Furthermore, kids who get the drug habit will cost the system tremendous amounts of time and money. Prevention is a better solution than arresting and treating kids who become addicted, as I'm sure you agree.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Richard Adhikari
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 1:00:42 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Richard Adhikari

Email: planner.filler-6r@icloud.com

District: D11

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

Furthermore, kids who get the drug habit will cost the system tremendous amounts of time and money. Prevention is a better solution than arresting and treating kids who become addicted, as I'm sure you agree.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Kristen Fenech
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 2:21:21 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Kristen Fenech

Email: fenechkristen@hotmail.com

District: D2

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Kristen Fenech
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 2:21:21 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Kristen Fenech

Email: fenechkristen@hotmail.com

District: D2

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Solange Levy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 4:01:52 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Solange Levy

Email: solange94121@hotmail.com

District: D1

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Solange Levy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 4:01:52 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Solange Levy

Email: solange94121@hotmail.com

District: D1

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: mary walsh gorski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 4:18:30 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	mary walsh gorski
Email	mcwgorski@gmail.com
District	D1
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: mary walsh gorski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 4:18:30 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	mary walsh gorski
Email	mcwgorski@gmail.com
District	D1
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Stephanie Lehman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 4:28:33 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Stephanie Lehman
Email	slehman21@yahoo.com
District	D1
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Stephanie Lehman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 4:28:33 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Stephanie Lehman
Email	slehman21@yahoo.com
District	D1
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Dina Gartsman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 6:05:52 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Dina Gartsman
Email	dina.gartsman@gmail.com
District	D3
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Dina Gartsman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 6:05:52 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Dina Gartsman
Email	dina.gartsman@gmail.com
District	D3
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Fred Medick
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 6:12:24 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Fred Medick

Email: fredm04@gmail.com

District: D8

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Fred Medick
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 6:12:24 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Fred Medick

Email: fredm04@gmail.com

District: D8

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Andre Seibel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 6:15:42 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Andre Seibel
Email	andre.seibel@gmail.com
District	D9
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Andre Seibel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 6:15:42 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Andre Seibel
Email	andre.seibel@gmail.com
District	D9
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Qlik Webinars
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Qlik Insider: Your Stop on the AI Reality Tour!
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 7:18:31 AM

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

To view this email as a web page, click here

Qlik



Curious about where data and AI are headed next?

Join Qlik customers and partners who attended a recent AI Reality Tour as they share their bold strategies and innovations shaping the future of data and analytics.

This fast-paced special edition of Qlik Insider gives you exclusive access to:

- Emerging trends that are redefining how data and AI are used across industries.
- What's generating buzz at the AI Reality Tour
- Real-world stories from data leaders driving transformation
- The bold steps organizations are taking to stay ahead and rethink their approach to data

Be part of the conversation that's shaping what comes next.

Register Now

Qlik

QlikTech, Inc. | 211 South Gulph Road, Suite 500 | King of Prussia, PA 19406 United States | 1 (888) 828-9768

Qlik Privacy & Cookie Notice

This email was sent to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org. If you no longer wish to receive these emails you may unsubscribe at any time.

From: Michael Jones
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 7:35:31 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Michael Jones
Email	mj357@comcast.net
District	D2
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Colin Jones
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 7:39:35 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Colin Jones
Email	mj357@comcast.net
District	D2
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Johanna Sanders
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 7:47:23 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Johanna Sanders
Email	joh.highway.sanders@gmail.com
District	D3
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Thomas Russell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 7:50:25 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Thomas Russell
Email	russellgsc@yahoo.com
District	D6
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Kathleen Daly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 8:29:37 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Kathleen Daly
Email	kdalysf@outlook.com
District	D3
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Ted Manahan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 8:51:31 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Ted Manahan
Email	theodore.manahan@gmail.com
District	D4
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: John DeCock
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 8:54:31 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	John DeCock
Email	john.decock@gmail.com
District	D8
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Mike Nohr
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 9:03:38 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Mike Nohr
Email	mikejnohr@aol.com
District	D4
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: David Farrell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 9:04:33 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	David Farrell
Email	dbfvancouver@gmail.com
District	D4
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Lizzie Faliano
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 9:09:25 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Lizzie Faliano

Email: 415irisheyes@gmail.com

District: D4

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Karen Dold
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 9:17:32 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Karen Dold
Email	trattratt@aol.com
District	D3
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Krista Loretto
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 9:20:28 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Krista Loretto

Email: kristaspenceloretto@yahoo.com

District: D2

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Sarah Byun
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 9:30:34 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Sarah Byun

Email: sarahmhardman@gmail.com

District: D2

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: maryann dresner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 9:39:45 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	maryann dresner
Email	madresner@cs.com
District	D8
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Stewart Wilber
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 9:45:22 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Stewart Wilber
Email	s.wilber@mindspring.com
District	D8
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Melissa Ippolito
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 9:48:28 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Melissa Ippolito
Email	melissaippo@gmail.com
District	D1
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Calum MacKay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 10:36:37 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Calum MacKay

Email: calumlmackay@gmail.com

District: D8

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Jason Kim
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 10:45:37 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Jason Kim

Email: gocaljohn@somasf.com

District: D6

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: LaVive Kiely
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 10:46:32 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	LaVive Kiely
Email	kielykids@gmail.com
District	D7
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Susan Cerce
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 10:53:32 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Susan Cerce

Email: SCerce@yahoo.com

District: D1

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing AGAIN to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Karen Wood
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 11:20:18 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Karen Wood
Email	karenmillerwood@gmail.com
District	D7
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Sally Allen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 11:46:41 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Sally Allen

Email: sally@sallyallen.com

District: D2

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Stephen Henderson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 11:49:37 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Stephen Henderson
Email	t.stephen.henderson@gmail.com
District	D1
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: John Bitoff
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 12:21:37 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	John Bitoff
Email	bitoffj@gmail.com
District	D2
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Lefteris Eleftheriou
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 1:09:30 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Lefteris Eleftheriou
Email	lefteri28@gmail.com
District	D7
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Ruth Parker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 1:39:18 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Ruth Parker

Email: rsparker@mail.sfsu.edu

District: D7

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Nancy Zajac
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 2:54:35 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Nancy Zajac

Email: njzajac@aol.com

District: D4

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Stephen Martin-Pinto
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 3:45:26 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Stephen Martin-Pinto
Email	stephen@stephenmartinpinto.com
District	D7
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Gerald Moore
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 3:57:31 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Gerald Moore
Email	gerry@geraldrmoore.com
District	D10
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Michael Larsen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 5:24:29 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Michael Larsen
Email	epml@aol.com
District	D3
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Samantha Mostovoy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 6:33:26 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Samantha Mostovoy
Email	samanthamostovoy@gmail.com
District	D7
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: K Long
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 7:57:30 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	K Long
Email	Kslong1@gmail.com
District	D5
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Jacqueline Westby
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 8:29:30 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Jacqueline Westby
Email	jackiewestby@sbcglobal.net
District	D11
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Howard Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 9:41:23 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Howard Lee

Email: howard.lee90@gmail.com

District: D7

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

This issue is very important to me and I believe that it is important to you as well, especially if you have kids.

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

Howard Lee (District 7)

From: Nathan Lemkhin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 11:27:34 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Nathan Lemkhin

Email: nathanlemkhin@yahoo.com

District: D7

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Kathy Price
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:10:28 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Kathy Price

Email: kathyprice@yahoo.com

District: D8

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: donna Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 12:53:25 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	donna Brown
Email	donna.brown05@gmail.com
District	D7
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Leslie Podell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 7:25:32 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Leslie Podell
Email	leslie@podell.com
District	D2
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Gloria Arcelona
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 7:54:24 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent	Gloria Arcelona
Email	gaicardo@gmail.com
District	D1
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Jonathan Bowling
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2025 2:31:26 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 Chief of Police

From your constituent: Jonathan Bowling

Email: baoshan88@gmail.com

District: D4

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

Item 62

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)
Subject:	File No. 250589 BAO - 11 letters
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 1:18:47 PM
Attachments:	11 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 11 letters form members of the public regarding:

> File No. 250589, Ord. No. 119-25 - Budget and Appropriation Ordinance appropriating all estimated receipts and all estimated expenditures for Departments of the City and County of San Francisco as of May 30, 2025, for the Fiscal Years (FYs) ending June 30, 2026, and June 30, 2027.

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:	Kevin Zaney
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Saturday, July 26, 2025 11:50:55 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo4N2EwODFjMGYyZGM0MjBkNzI4MWRhMzhlZjc1YTYzYTo3OmRiM2I6OGE0MTFhNTVhODE1ZTZjYWE1MTE2MjIwNzE1NDE1MTVlNWI4MWNiNWM5NDI3ODhlNzViOWUxMzI4YjNiMmZlYTpwOlQ6Tg

Thank you!

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Alexis Woods
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	Invest in the Best for SFPD
Date:	Saturday, July 26, 2025 12:38:33 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpmMjQ1YmUwYTJiOGNiZjg0ZjhlZTNlYWYwMjkzNjEzNzo3OjA5MTg6NGFhZWY2NjRkMmM3YmRiNDI0MTVlYjM4OGYyNmQxMTY0YmJjMGRkOGEwZDBhMTI2ZWMwZmVhNjVjM2MxMzE4MTp0OlQ6Tg

Thank you!

Alexis Woods
415-613-1521

From: Teresa Durling
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject: Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 1:59:21 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzowZmQ0ODhjN2E2NTY5NWUxODBjMzNhNTIwMDNkZTI1Nzo3OmU0NTA6M2EyM2ZhZTgxM2ZjYmQxZmY3OThlOWY1OWQ5MWJmMjRiZTU5ZDgzZWE2MDRhZGE0Y2EyYWU0MDMyZjZiMzI4MjpwOlQ6Tg

Thank you!

Sent from my iPad

From: Jim Rocchio
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject: Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 2:21:03 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzoyZjNjMzBjNjk3Yzc3NjZTFhYjEyMmQwZmQwYmNjODU2Zjo3OjZlMzI6OWUyNzc3MWEzNjQ0OWM3OTI4NTQ0YjkwM2ViOGNiZTliZGM4OTMwZjA1NDk2MjRhZTFjMTU2MDFlZTNhZWFmNTp0OkY6Tg

Thank you!

_____
Jim Rocchio
415-608-7949

From:	Charissa Schaefer
To:	Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Cc:	MahmoodStaff; Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	Please do not support an increase in the SFPD budget
Date:	Saturday, July 26, 2025 2:52:14 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Mahmood,

I'm a resident of District 5. I'm writing to ask you to please ignore the requests from GrowSF and others about the SFPD recruitment budget increases.

I believe it would be the best thing for us if we could instead invest in other social safety nets like support for the following:
Housing,
LGBTQ+ crises,
Mental Health crises,
Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault,
Youth crises,
Elder crises, &
Substance Abuse
(via https://dontcallthepolice.com/san-francisco/)

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding will instead encourage us to find forceful solutions to emergencies that might be solved by other means.
- Increasing the lateral hiring bonus would bring in officers who are not local which means they have no investment in or context for the community they are policing.
- Any "special partnership" between schools and policing will only reinforce to students that force is the answer and we spend more money in that direction than any other.
- The SFPD can modernize their technology without focusing on new recruits and instead focusing on who is already there, who already does a good job at responding to emergency situations without force, & who can de-escalate situations effectively. The technology at their disposal should meet the job they should already be doing and not be focused on growing the force larger.

The budget for the SFPD is already too big and could be used to build out other social safety nets.

Thank you!
Charissa Schaefer

From:	Sandra G
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	SFPD recruitment
Date:	Saturday, July 26, 2025 3:49:55 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

First, I want to thank all involved in maintaining a high standard in the recruitment of our officers! It brought me great reassurance to hear that they are thoroughly screened & vetted/prepared for the job at hand.

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

Grow SF's proposal makes sense:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

I also imagine that delegating non-police tasks (crisis intervention & medical/psych emergencies) from the police force would greatly help the current & interested staff in focusing on their actual job…. Policing.

Thank you! & way to keep the high standards & our citizens safe.

Dr. Sandra Georgescu
Licensed Clinical Psychologist - IL, NV, CA
ACBS Peer Reviewed Trainer

From: David Henderson
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject: Let's Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date: Saturday, July 26, 2025 6:38:22 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzozYTdhN2NkNTQ5NzU1NjllMjVmNTJhNTkzZTQwMzkyZjo3OjgyMjc6NTY1MTVjYTlmOWI0NTI2ZjQ3Y2UwZTFmZjY3YjY2NDJjZDVlZWEzYzE5M2Q5NmE0MzA1ZmUxMDlkOGRkMDZjYzpwOlQ6Tg

Thank you!

Sent from my iPad

From:	David Tran
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject:	Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date:	Monday, July 28, 2025 9:49:55 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I’m writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco’s Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/

Thank you!

From: Paul C
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); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; WaltonStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject: Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date: Wednesday, July 30, 2025 9:20:01 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo0MzA2ODI4YWNhN2MzNjRmYzdiZmYzZTZkZDgyYjY5NDo3OmZjNDA6MzNjMjA0NGQ4OWUzYmI1MzQzYjI5MzJmM2UyM2VlNDNhY2U2ZDRlZjZlZmFjOGNhNTE4NDhiY2QwODY0YjEwNzp0OkY6Tg

Thank you!

From: Richard Carini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Commending Supervisor Jackie Fielder
Date: Wednesday, July 23, 2025 10:10:55 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 Fielder,

Thank you for your strong leadership and for voting no on the City's budget which does not meet the needs of every day San Franciscans. Thank you for your vote to keep Prop C intact along with Supervisors Walton and Chen, for respecting the will of voters, and for standing up for our democratic process. Last but not least, thank you for voting NO on the terrible RV ban along with Supervisor Walton which will simply exacerbate the homelessness crisis by forcing many working-class, largely Latino, families to give up their housing. You, Jackie Fielder, are among the few representatives we have in this city who reflects our values, especially in light of the ICE raids that are terrifying and kidnapping our neighbors. We are watching and we see you!

Richard Carini
rdcarini@gmail.com
1520 Pershing Dr Unit F
San Francisco, California 94129

From: Jolie Wu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Commending Supervisor Jackie Fielder
Date: Wednesday, July 23, 2025 5:19:05 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 Fielder,

Thank you for your strong leadership and for voting no on the City's budget which does not meet the needs of every day San Franciscans. Thank you for your vote to keep Prop C intact along with Supervisors Walton and Chen, for respecting the will of voters, and for standing up for our democratic process. Last but not least, thank you for voting NO on the terrible RV ban along with Supervisor Walton which will simply exacerbate the homelessness crisis by forcing many working-class, largely Latino, families to give up their housing. You, Jackie Fielder, are among the few representatives we have in this city who reflects our values, especially in light of the ICE raids that are terrifying and kidnapping our neighbors. We are watching and we see you!

Jolie Wu
joliewu0710@gmail.com
1865 Fulton St Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94117

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: Let"s Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 8:10:34 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding police recruitment.

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.

-----Original Message-----
From: Greg Hodges <gregmhodges@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 5:45 PM
To: 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: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@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>; act+sfpd-recruiting@growsf.org
Subject: Let's Invest in the Best for SFPD (via GrowSF.org)

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to ask you to help SFPD recruit the best officers in the nation.

I believe we can do this by:

- Increasing SFPD recruitment funding to support more test-prep sessions for police recruits
- Increase the lateral hiring bonus so that we can source the best police officers from other municipalities
- A special partnership between SFPD and San Francisco's Colleges to support the next generation of local police officers
- Modernizing the technology that SFPD recruitment runs on to ensure our recruiting process is efficient and effective

A fully staffed police force is what we need for a safer San Francisco for all of us. Read more at https://urlavanan.click/v2/r01/___https://growsf.org/research/2025-07-21-sfpd-hiring/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpkMzBlY2E1Y2M2Y2ZhYmFiNWI3ODNmZDZiMmVmNmM1ZTo3OmJkNTY6ZWVhNDg2M2RhZWYyY2M5YWVkNGJmNjk2ZDE4ODljZDE1ZjdiZjdmM2Y3MzdhMDRmMmY0ZGFmZWExNTdmMjJiNTpwOkY6Tg

Thank you!

Greg Hodges

Item 63

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)
Subject:	Ticketed events in Golden Gate Park - 2 letters
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 1:25:08 PM
Attachments:	2 letters GGP events.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 letters from Kathy Porter regarding ticketed events in Golden Gate Park.

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: Bradyport
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Privatization of Golden Gate Park
Date: Thursday, July 31, 2025 6:19:25 PM

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

I'm voicing my disappointment in the continued use of Golden Gate Park for these large, multi-day concerts. It was bad enough to have three days of Outsidelands and now it is compounded with additional concerts.

It is impossible to park (unless you have a garage) anywhere near your house. Residents were never consulted before entering these long-term contracts. The park gets trampled, animals are terrified and residents are inconvenienced.
Amazing how politicians can be so tone deaf.

Kathy Porter

From:	Bradyport
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	NO MORE CONCERTS IN GGP
Date:	Wednesday, August 20, 2025 8:17:45 AM

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

Another concert has been added after Hardly Strictly Bluegrass, who approved this? As residents of the westside, we have had to endure repeated disruptions from large multi-day concerts held in Golden Gate Park. These events have caused significant issues for the community and the environment, including:

- Large sections of the park being closed for weeks due to concert setup and breakdown.
- Residents unable to leave their homes or move their vehicles during event days due to traffic congestion and restrictions.
- Excessive noise levels that disturb residents well into the evening.
- The park's ecosystem suffering damage from the sheer scale of these gatherings.

These concerts are clearly a money-making venture at the expense of residents and the park itself. There are more appropriate venues in the city—such as Chase Center or the Cow Palace—that are designed to host large-scale events with proper infrastructure including parking, seating, and restroom facilities.

The westside community is tired of bearing the burden of these disruptions. We urge the City to reconsider allowing Golden Gate Park to be used for these types of events and to redirect them to venues better suited for this purpose.

Kathy Porter

Item 64

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)
Subject:	Graffiti Abatement Program - 2 letters
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 1:29:39 PM
Attachments:	2 letters graffiti abatement.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 letters from members of the public regarding the Graffiti Abatement Program.

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: Ingleside San Francisco
To: ChenStaff; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); MelgarStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chang, Eva (DPW)
Subject: City Graffiti Removal "Opt in Program" is NOT WORKING!
Date: Monday, July 28, 2025 11:19:19 AM

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

Mayor Lurie
Supervisor Chen
Supervisor Melgar

One of the ROOT of the PROBLEM in San Francisco is when City Departments & Workers Dont do the Job that City Funds (Property Taxpayers) PAY for City Services!

Having Multiple Reporting thru 311 of Graffiti on Commercial Buildings on Ocean Ave and then have NO REMOVAL ACTIONS TAKEN even after SEVERAL MONTHS is UNACCEPTABLE and GHETTO - IZED our Neighborhoods and CITY MORE!!

Having the 311 Reports 1010001553619, 101001692919,101001456441, for 1301/1315 Ocean Ave "Auto Shop"
WHOLE SIDE of COMMERCIAL BUILDING become a BILLBOARD of GRAFFITI for MONTHS is ADVERTISEMENT to all the VAGRANTS and TAGGERS of the CITY Permission to TAG or GRAFFITI more and MORE on OCEAN AVE...Making it the NEXT GHETTO outside of TENDERLOIN....IS THAT WHAT WE WANT???

CLEANING UP DOWNTOWN SHOULD NOT CHASE ALL THE VAGRANTS TO THE OUTER NEIGHBORHOODS TO DEAL WITH!!!

OCEAN AVE and its NEIGHBORHOODS WAS GETTING BETTER TILL LAST 2 ADMINISTRATIONS (MAYOR LEE to BREED) that DID NOTHING BUT ADD MORE DEFICIT AND MORE BENEFITS TO VAGRANTS AND CRIMINALS!!

WHAT ABOUT THE LAW ABIDING TAX PAYING AND WORKING RESIDENTS/PROPERTY OWNERS???

ONLY SAN FRANCISCO is DECLINING IN VALUE and SAFETY among all the CITIES SOUTH of the CITY to SAN JOSE....WE ARE THE GHETTO CITY!

HOPEFULLY MAYOR LURIE will STOP THE BLEEDING And BRING SAN FRANCISCO BACK TO ITS FORMER GLORY....BUT WE CANT DO THAT IF ALL ITS FUNDS GOES TO THE "ENDLESS MONEY PIT of SERVICING ALL THE INCOMING and PRESENT VAGRANTS AND HOMELESS ....THAT CONTRIBUTE NOTHING TO THE CITY BUT CRIME AND TRASH AND UNCLEAN QUALITY OF LIFE!!....if NOTHING DONE SOON,IT WILL SPREAD LIKE A MOLD/INFECTIONS THROUGHOUT THIS ONCE BEAUTIFUL CITY!!

INGLESIDE NEIGHBORS

From: wy Y
To: ChenStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Iterest Form - Graffiti Abatement Opt-In Pilot Program
Date: Monday, July 28, 2025 12:54:33 PM

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

Interest Form - Graffiti Abatement Opt-In Pilot Program
https://share.google/WvRSP0QD4J8T0ukoD

This Pilot Program is NOT Working for repeated reporting thru 311...it's just an excuses from DPW and Property Owners with "Graffiti on their property to NOT PAY or DO ANY ACTIONS!!....Ocean Ave,just walk or drive down this street!

Item 65

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)
Subject:	JFK Drive - 3 letters
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 1:38:24 PM
Attachments:	3 letters JFK Drive.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 3 letters from members of the public regarding John F. Kennedy Drive.

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: Marsha Hallet
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: JFK Drive
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 6:29:46 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The 24/7 closure of JFK drive has left many people unable to access Golden Gate Park and its institutions. The current closure is for those who live close enough, have the money to pay for parking, or are able bodied enough to travel on foot or bicycle.

We need to go back to the compromise that was struck and reopen JFK as it was before the pandemic!

Sincerely,
Marsha Hallet

From: Miriam Abramowitsch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: JFK
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 8:12:52 PM

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,
Miriam Abramowitsch
Berkeley, CA 94705

From: Nancy White
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: JFK Drive
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 7:45:35 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The 24/7 closure of JFK drive has left many people unable to access Golden Gate Park and its institutions. The current closure is for those who live close enough, have the money to pay for parking, or are able bodied enough to travel on foot or bicycle.

We need to go back to the compromise that was struck and reopen JFK as it was before the pandemic!

Sincerely,
Nancy White

Item 66

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:	A major player in the homelessness industrial complex just walked off with $2.8M of taxpayer dollars...
Date:	Thursday, July 24, 2025 1:52:27 PM

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,

It is your duty and responsibility to act in the interests of San Franciscans and us taxpayers.

PLEASE MASSIVELY REJECT THE PAYMENT OF THIS $2.8M SETTLEMENT.

This so-called “non-profit”, mob of corrupt activists and other lunatics doesn’t deserve a single cent. That is to start with Jennifer Friedenbach, who might want to pick up a real job, for once in her miserable freeloader’s life.

https://www.sfblueprint.org/blog/a-major-player-in-the-homelessness-industrial-complex-just-walked-off-with-2-8m-of-taxpayer-dollars

In 2022, the Coalition on Homelessness sued the City to stop its encampment sweeps. Well, they just won $2,828,000 of taxpayer dollars (amidst a massive structural budget deficit) to cover the cost of their attorneys fees, pending approval by the Board of Supervisors.

While this will stop them from continuing to pursue costly and frivolous claims in appellate court, it hurts to see so much go to an organization that doesn’t always seem to have the city’s interest at heart.

https://www.sfblueprint.org/blog/a-major-player-in-the-homelessness-industrial-complex-just-walked-off-with-2-8m-of-taxpayer-dollars

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:	REJECT AND VOTE NO ON THE $2.8M HOMELESS COALITION MOB SETTLEMENT
Date:	Thursday, July 24, 2025 1:55:39 PM

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,

It is your duty and responsibility to act in the interests of San Franciscans and us taxpayers.

PLEASE MASSIVELY REJECT THE PAYMENT OF THIS $2.8M SETTLEMENT.

This so-called “non-profit”, mob of corrupt activists and other lunatics doesn’t deserve a single cent.

That is to start with Jennifer Friedenbach, who might want to pick up a real job, for once in her miserable freeloader’s life of nuisance to our city.

https://www.sfblueprint.org/blog/a-major-player-in-the-homelessness-industrial-complex-just-walked-off-with-2-8m-of-taxpayer-dollars

AGAIN - PLEASE VOTE NO AND MASSIVELY REJECT THE PAYMENT OF THIS $2.8M SETTLEMENT.

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); Sawyer, Jason (POL); SFPD Northern Station, (POL); Info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com; Cschulman@lowerpolkcbd.org
Subject:	[D2/D3/D5] Illegal homeless encampments, trash, filth, all over Austin, Fern, Hemlock, Cedar, Myrtle, Olive, Eddy, Ellis, Willow, Elm Streets.
Date:	Thursday, July 24, 2025 4:00:00 PM

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

Illegal homeless encampments, trash, filth, graffitis, all over Austin, Fern, Hemlock, Cedar, Myrtle, Olive, Eddy, Ellis, Willow, Elm Streets.

Mainly alley streets but not only: Eddy, Ellis, Sutter, Geary, Franklin, Van Ness, Larkin, Hyde, Leavenworth also are severely impacted.

This is an ongoing issue, spreading all across Lower Polk, Little Saigon, Tenderloin and Tenderloin-adjacent neighborhoods… across parts of D2, D3, and D5…

Why so little progress?

Why are you allowing them to come back?

Can we please get this under control?

- Where are the SFPD car and beat patrols?
- Trash needs to be picked up day and night
- Graffitis need immediate paint jobs.
- Crackheads and other encampments require immediate removal
- Can’t all of these tents and other junk be seized and thrown away, to prevent their proliferation and reinstallation at another location?
- Our streets and sidewalks must be power washed as much as needed, and need to remain clean, safe, and accessible at all times. Including on alley streets.

Please advise.

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); Sawyer, Jason (POL); SFPD Northern Station, (POL); Info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com; Cschulman@lowerpolkcbd.org
Subject:	Encampments on 11xx Sutter St and Fern St between Polk and Larkin St.
Date:	Thursday, July 24, 2025 4:19:31 PM

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

Encampments on 11xx Sutter St Block and Fern St between Polk and Larkin St.

2 in front (each side of Sutter St) of the Lower Polk CBD, the rest on the back alley at 0-99 Fern St.

Can we get this under control?

Please them out immediately.

Thank you.

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); Sawyer, Jason (POL); SFPD Northern Station, (POL); Info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com; Cschulman@lowerpolkcbd.org
Subject:	Most SFMTA transit shelters missing back windows / glass panels / windbreaks all over town…
Date:	Thursday, July 24, 2025 6:19:55 PM

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,

Most SFMTA transit shelters are missing back windows / windbreaks all over town…

Including on “freshly” inaugurated lines such as the 49, following the costly revamp of Van Ness Ave, 99% (except perhaps closer to the Marina) of bus/transit shelters no longer have any glass panels or windbreaks, as the homeless and other crackheads destroyed them one after the other…

Also true on other lines like the 2, 3, 14, 19, and many others. People simply just don’t respect anything. Most importantly, the vandals don’t ever face any sanctions or form of punishment for their destructive actions.

The previous administration, in its well-known cluelessness and incompetence, hasn’t done anything about it. Instead, remained widely complacent with these problematic populations.

Could we now expect some change? Can we please have them, finally, repaired / replaced?

Isn’t there a reserve budget line item for these types of ongoing, foreseeable repairs?

Thank you.

JD.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); MTABoard@sfmta.com; constituentrqst@sfmta.com; CON, Munifunding (CON); Muni Customer Service; 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:	Re: SF People's Transit - Upcoming Protest (Every 2nd/4th Saturday of the Month)
Date:	Friday, July 25, 2025 10:58:51 AM

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,

Please DO NOT under any circumstances concede anything to these radical-left lunatics.

https://sharethemoney.institute/july-26th-action

Our MUNI buses are constantly filled and crowded with a majority of fare offenders, including homeless, crackheads, and other drug addicts, who make it unbearable for the legitimate law abiding minority of fare paying riders. And both safety and sanitary (including the olfactive) conditions of the buses/trains are beyond questionable at this point.

NO, MUNI ISN'T FREE! AND IT SHOULDN'T BE.

Irrespective of what these lunatic free loaders have to think or say about it.

THOSE WHO DON'T PAY SIMPLY SHOULDN'T BE ALLOWED TO BOARD. PERIOD.

It's that simple.

Why can't operators enforce this rather common sense rule that is in place every where else in the US, everywhere else in the world?

People should only be able to board from the front of the bus. And if they don't pay, they simply just don't get to board.

Is this too much to ask?

AGAIN - THOSE WHO DON'T PAY SIMPLY SHOULDN'T BE ALLOWED TO BOARD. PERIOD.

Please advise.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (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; 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); Sawyer, Jason (POL); SFPD Northern Station, (POL); Info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com; Cschulman@lowerpolkcbd.org
Subject:	Re: [D2/D3/D5] Illegal homeless encampments, trash, filth, all over Austin, Fern, Hemlock, Cedar, Myrtle, Olive, Eddy, Ellis, Willow, Elm Streets.
Date:	Friday, July 25, 2025 2:10:26 PM

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

Any updates on this particular matter?

Our streets and alley streets are such a mess, filled with homeless, crackheads, trash, urine, feces and graffitis…

We just can’t have that.

Please clear all encampments in the Lower Polk / Little Saigon / Tenderloin and other adjacent neighborhoods.

> On Jul 24, 2025, at 15:59, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Illegal homeless encampments, trash, filth, graffitis, all over Austin, Fern, Hemlock, Cedar, Myrtle, Olive, Eddy, Ellis, Willow, Elm Streets.
>
> Mainly alley streets but not only: Eddy, Ellis, Sutter, Geary, Franklin, Van Ness, Larkin, Hyde, Leavenworth also are severely impacted.
>
> This is an ongoing issue, spreading all across Lower Polk, Little Saigon, Tenderloin and Tenderloin-adjacent neighborhoods… across parts of D2, D3, and D5…
>
> Why so little progress?
>
> Why are you allowing them to come back?
>
> Can we please get this under control?
>
> - Where are the SFPD car and beat patrols?
> - Trash needs to be picked up day and night
> - Graffitis need immediate paint jobs.
> - Crackheads and other encampments require immediate removal
> - Can’t all of these tents and other junk be seized and thrown away, to prevent their proliferation and reinstallation at another location?
> - Our streets and sidewalks must be power washed as much as needed, and need to remain clean, safe, and accessible at all times. Including on alley streets.
>
> Please advise.
>

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Board of Supervisors (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; 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: REJECT AND VOTE NO ON THE $2.8M HOMELESS COALITION MOB SETTLEMENT
Date:	Saturday, July 26, 2025 11:34:17 AM

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

Neither does the homeless coalition mob or the ACLU deserve our hard earned taxpayer dollars.

Please revisit this rather moronic decision and reject this absurd, unwarranted settlement.

Have these morons pay for their own legal fees. San Francisco taxpayers shouldn't have to chip in. Not even for a single cent.

Any dollar spent on this will only enable more of the same and allow them to run yet another stunt against the city.

Please do not be that naive!

Thank you.

> On Jul 24, 2025, at 13:55, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Dear Mayor and Supervisors,
>
> It is your duty and responsibility to act in the interests of San Franciscans and us taxpayers.
>
> PLEASE MASSIVELY REJECT THE PAYMENT OF THIS $2.8M SETTLEMENT.
>
> This so-called "non-profit", mob of corrupt activists and other lunatics doesn't deserve a single cent.
>
> That is to start with Jennifer Friedenbach, who might want to pick up a real job, for once in her miserable freeloader's life of nuisance to our city.
>
> https://www.sfblueprint.org/blog/a-major-player-in-the-homelessness-industrial-complex-just-walked-off-with-2-8m-of-taxpayer-dollars
>
> AGAIN - PLEASE VOTE NO AND MASSIVELY REJECT THE PAYMENT

OF THIS $2.8M SETTLEMENT.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	MTABoard@sfmta.com; constituentrqst@sfmta.com; 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:	REOPEN MARKET ST TO ALL CAR TRAFFIC.
Date:	Saturday, August 2, 2025 4:47:14 PM

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

Saturday afternoon. Most storefront are shuttered. Barely anyone on the streets and sidewalk, all the way from Powell to Embarcadero.

This place used to be so pleasant and lively any weekend 10-15 years ago.

Can we please end this absurdity and reopen Market St to all car traffic?

The moronic choices of the past, made back in 2018-2019 shouldn’t have to keep on haunting us forever.

Screw those radical-left lunatics.

Have some political courage.

REOPEN MARKET ST TO ALL CAR TRAFFIC.
REOPEN THE GREAT HIGHWAY.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); DPW, (DPW); Nagano, Tomio (BOS); SFPD, Chief (POL); Sawyer, Jason (POL); SFPD Northern Station, (POL); Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Chris Schulman; info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	URGENT - Passed out crackheads, homeless, junk, all over 1-99, 100-199 Fern St. IMMEDIATE ATTENTION/RESOLUTION REQUIRED.
Date:	Thursday, August 14, 2025 5:52:10 PM

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

1-99, 100-199 Fern St.

About half a dozen homeless, junk, filth, passed out crackheads, some in-between planters, some inside the planters. Some other zombies performing their fentanyl fold special…

What a disgrace. We just can't have that.

Please clean up this mess IMMEDIATELY.

Location:
- Fern St between Larkin and Polk (000 block)
- Fern St between Polk and Van Ness (100 block)

Thank you.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Press Office, Mayor (MYR); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); SFPD Northern Station, (POL); Sawyer, Jason (POL); SFPD, Chief (POL); Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Nagano, Tomio (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
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); 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); Sawyer, Jason (POL); SFPD Northern Station, (POL)
Subject:	Unruly Dirt Bikes, Sideshows… Make San Francisco Safer and Quieter for Everyone!
Date:	Friday, August 15, 2025 7:50:20 AM

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,
Dear Chief of Police,

I am sure you're all aware of this petition at this point.

While the technology is there to track these people in town and before they even get here and terrorize our neighborhoods…

Where is SFPD when this goes on and why is there little to no enforcement?

This has been going on for a while now, including under the previous clueless and incompetent Breed/Peskin/Scott administration

Time to make some arrests, and seize all of these vehicles. Wake up, please!

https://www.change.org/p/make-san-francisco-safer-and-quieter-for-everyone

https://abc7news.com/amp/post/crackdown-coming-illegal-dirt-bikes-san-francisco-chinatown-residents-business-owners-fed/17533757/

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Sauter, Danny (BOS); Danny Sauter; danny@dannyd3.com; SauterStaff; Nagano, Tomio (BOS); MTABoard@sfmta.com; constituentrqst@sfmta.com; DPW, (DPW); SFPD Northern Station, (POL); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); Sawyer, Jason (POL); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Re: URGENT - Recurring FERN ST CHAOS Every Friday/Saturday/Sunday nights!
Date:	Sunday, August 17, 2025 10:47:33 AM
Attachments:	IMG_9689.png

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

Another Saturday, another shit show..

- 000 and 100 blocks of Fern St.
- Polk and Fern.
- Polk and Sutter.

Where was the SF MTA?
Where were the tow trucks?
Why can't there seem to be any enforcement?

When there's a will there's a way! So where was that will?

Let's start with correctly signaling the permanent no parking zones - at all times on Fern St.

Not that this will deter those who park on those red lines and sidewalks. But it might help.

As for these repeat offenders, please tow their goddamn cars away!

We've all had enough.

Thank you!



NO
PARKING
ANY
TIME

> On Aug 9, 2025, at 08:59, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Last night again..
>
> And again, zero enforcement.
>
>> On Jul 23, 2025, at 12:46, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>> Good morning Danny and Team!
>>
>> Any updates on this?
>>
>> Can we expect some kind of enforcement going forward?
>>
>>>> On Jul 20, 2025, at 11:41, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> Happy Sunday Danny,
>>>
>>> Can your office please do something about it?
>>>
>>> Thanks again!
>>>
>>> Julien
>>>
>>>>> On Jul 20, 2025, at 10:32, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> Another Saturday, another shit show!
>>>>
>>>> Polk/Fern, Sutter/Polk and surrounding areas filled with illegal parking, sidewalk parking, double parking, impossible car and pedestrian circulation.
>>>>
>>>> Despite multiple 311 reports, no enforcement whatsoever.
>>>>
>>>> Why so much leniency?
>>>>
>>>> Please take immediate actions and remediations.
>>>>
>>>> Thank you.
>>>>
>>>>>> On Jun 22, 2025, at 10:49, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> Dear Mayor and Supervisors,
>>>>> Dear SFMTA Board,
>>>>>
>>>>> Good morning,
>>>>>
>>>>> Every weekend, both 100 and 200 blocks of Fern St at taken over by lawlessness, hordes of unruly vehicles parking all over our sidewalks, red zones, permanent no parking zones, and also blocking

access to the garages of our residential buildings.
>>>>>
>>>>> Despite repeated incidents, SFMTA (before midnight) and SFPD (after midnight) repeatedly failed to respond to the reports/incidents, leading to a complete chaos down our street, and some of our neighbors unable to access their buildings for several hours, at times, backing up the entire street at the same time.
>>>>>
>>>>> These 311 cases simply get closed without response or citation.
>>>>>
>>>>> We cannot tolerate such absurd levels of leniency. Why can’t there be SFMTA / SFPD enforcement of these issues? If folks are unable or unwilling to do their job, perhaps they need to be fired and replaced.
>>>>>
>>>>> Why can’t these vehicles simply be cited and towed?
>>>>>
>>>>> PLEASE! Give these morons the lesson they fully deserve. CITE AND TOW THEM ALL AWAY!
>>>>>
>>>>> Thank you.
>>>>>
>>>> <image5.jpeg>
>>>>>
>>>> <image1.jpeg>
>>>> <image2.png>
>>> <image3.png>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Sauter, Danny (BOS); Danny Sauter; danny@dannyd3.com; SauterStaff; Nagano, Tomio (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); Bell, Tita (BOS); info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Chris Schulman; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); DPW, (DPW); SFPD, Chief (POL); Sawyer, Jason (POL); SFPD Northern Station, (POL); Azevedo, Kaitlyn (ADM); Commission, Entertainment (ADM); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	What a shit-show again last night on Fern St! Please advise.
Date:	Sunday, August 24, 2025 9:07:09 AM

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

Good morning,

Despite multiple noise complaints and illegal parking reports to 311, dozens of cars were parked all over the sidewalks of Fern St (000 and 100 blocks, between Van Ness and Franklin) including red zones, permanent no parking zone at 106 Fern St, or in front of some garage entrances mid-block (140-150 Fern St)

Left over trash, junk, filth, usual urinations, and graffitis are now what's left of this mess.

The Mayes Bar and the other one next door (McTeague) are both mainly to blame. No or poor security staff on site. Complete leniency and lack of accountability. The same "establishments" repeatedly leave all of their trash/junk on the sidewalk (Mayes especially) for homeless folks to dig in, dig out, spill it all over again and again…

While this all started around 10 PM… Loud and drunk crowds remained in the area until at least 3 AM. And then drove away. Totally drunk and under other influence! Isn't that awesome?

No SFMTA parking enforcement. No SFPD enforcement whatsoever. Where the hell were they?

We just can't have that every single Friday, Saturday, Sunday…

We're all paying taxes here.

So, please explain.

We need proper enforcement next time, SFPD patrolling the area, SF MTA giving out citations, tow trucks taking them out, etc…

Ideally, there also shouldn't be a "next time".

Please take any/every required dispositions. Is that clear? Never. Again.

Thank you.

JD.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Nagano, Tomio (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); Bell, Tita (BOS); DPW, (DPW); danny@dannyd3.com; Danny Sauter; SauterStaff; info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Chris Schulman; Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
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); 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); Sawyer, Jason (POL); SFPD Northern Station, (POL); Info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com; Cschulman@lowerpolkcbd.org
Subject:	Lower Polk - What the hell happened to our neighborhood?
Date:	Sunday, August 24, 2025 10:16:30 AM

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

Good morning!

For god sake - What the hell happened again to our neighborhood?

What a post-apocalyptic mess again to wake up to!

Picture locations include but aren't limited to:

- Polk / Sutter
- Polk / Fern
- Polk / Bush
- Van Ness / Bush
- Van Ness / Fern

We just can't have that!

Requesting IMMEDIATE cleaning and power washing of both streets and sidewalks of:

- Fern St
- Polk St - All Lower Polk including any alley streets crossing Polk St
- Bush St
- Sutter St (especially near Hyde, Leavenworth, Larkin, Polk St, and Van Ness)

Requesting IMMEDIATE detailed cleaning of Fern St, including trash, filth, graffiti removal etc.. between Franklin and Polk, between Polk and Van Ness and between Van Ness and Franklin.

Requesting IMMEDIATE sanctions against the "Mayes Residential Hotel" for their constant littering of the area.

We're all paying taxes and we just can't wake up to this every freaking morning.

Do your job.

Make it happen.




HOTEL


GROCERIES

KING-CREAM 81

HAM



ACURA

PUBLIC
PARKING

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	DPW, (DPW); Nagano, Tomio (BOS); info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Chris Schulman; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Danny Sauter; danny@dannyd3.com; SFPD Northern Station, (POL); Sawyer, Jason (POL); SFPD, Chief (POL); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); Bell, Tita (BOS); Lower Neighbors
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); 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)
Subject:	000/100/200 Fern St: Trash, filth, graffitis, homeless encampments and crackheads
Date:	Tuesday, August 26, 2025 9:09:07 AM

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

Location: 000, 100, 200 blocks of Fern St
Between Larkin and Franklin Streets.

Good morning!

What a “beautiful” day in San Francisco again!

Please remove all graffitis, trash, filth, cardboard, passed out crackheads and other encampments.

Please clean up all planters at 0-50 Fern St from all the trash, filth, needles and other mess created.

One again. We just can’t have that.

Make sure to let these individuals know they are not welcome here.

Thank you.









WARNING
ANY
TIME

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	DPW, (DPW); Nagano, Tomio (BOS); Info@lowerpolkcbd.org; SauterStaff; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chris Schulman; SFPD Northern Station, (POL); danny@dannyd3.com; SFPD, Chief (POL); Sawyer, Jason (POL); Danny Sauter; Lower Neighbors; Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); Bell, Tita (BOS)
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); 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)
Subject:	Re: 000/100/200 Fern St: Trash, filth, graffitis, homeless encampments and crackheads
Date:	Tuesday, August 26, 2025 10:56:42 AM

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

Almost 11 AM - and still so much junk, filth, graffitis, and other passed out crackheads at 1-99 Fern St m, between Polk and Larkin.

Please advise.









> On Aug 26, 2025, at 09:08, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Location: 000, 100, 200 blocks of Fern St
> Between Larkin and Franklin Streets.
>
> Good morning!
>
> What a “beautiful” day in San Francisco again!
>
> Please remove all graffitis, trash, filth, cardboard, passed out crackheads and other encampments.
>
> Please clean up all planters at 0-50 Fern St from all the trash, filth, needles and other mess created.
>
> One again. We just can’t have that.
>
> Make sure to let these individuals know they are not welcome here.
>
> Thank you.
>
> <image0.jpeg>
>
> <image1.jpeg>
>

> <image2.jpeg>
>
> <image3.jpeg>
>
> <image4.jpeg>
>
> <image5.jpeg>
>
> <image6.jpeg>
>
> <image7.jpeg>
>
> <image8.jpeg>
>
> <image9.jpeg>
>
> <image10.jpeg>
>
> <image11.jpeg>
>
>

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Nagano, Tomio (BOS); Bell, Tita (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); DPW, (DPW); info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Chris Schulman; Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Danny Sauter; danny@dannyd3.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (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; 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)
Subject:	No street sweeping/cleaning in Lower Polk despite posted street cleaning…
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 9:35:54 AM

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

Good morning!

No street sweeping/cleaning in Lower Polk despite posted street cleaning… This Wednesday morning again!

This has now been an issue for several months/years.

Today again, street cleaning was supposed to take place between 7 and 8 AM.

Unfortunately, the mess from yesterday or last weekend is still here. Proof that no street cleaning actually occurs.

The 1000/1100/1200/1300 blocks of Sutter St, Polk Street between MacAlister to California St, or even every single alley street crossing Polk in this perimiter just speak for themselves. No street cleaning has been happening here for months or even years.

People are still receiving parking citations for parking there during this time despite no cleaning occurring. Forgetting about it, since it never happens anyways, I once experienced it and had to waste $100 on the SFMTA a couple of months ago, SFMTA which then so cluelessly rejected my legitimate dispute.

So regardless… How soon can you please get this street cleaning back on track?

We are paying taxes and need DPW to be on the job 24/7, and DPW to honor our street cleaning schedule.

What are they otherwise being paid for anyways?

Please provide me with additional information such as ETA, and future schedule, once this matter has been resolved.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	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); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	SFPD Northern Station, (POL); SFPD Tenderloin Station, (POL)
Subject:	URGENT - Alarming safety/sanitary situation in Lower Polk Alleys
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 5:53:31 PM

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

Lower Polk alley streets filled with homeless/crackheads, graffitis, urine, feces, and so much trash.

Including but not limited to:

- Austin St
- Fern St
- Hemlock St
- Daniel Burnham Ct
- Cedar St
- Myrtle St / Alice B Toklas
- Olive St
- Willow St
- Larch St

We just can’t have that.

Please advise.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	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); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	URGENT - Disgusting graffitis at 750 Eddy St
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 5:55:10 PM

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

Been like this for months at this point.

Please clean this up immediately.

Thank you.



outset.ai
Listen
to humans.
Don't replace
them.

outset.ai
Listen
to humans.
Don't replace
them.

Item 67

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)
Subject:	Lobbying activity in SF government - 43 letters
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:57:01 PM
Attachments:	43 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 43 letters from members of the public regarding lobbying activity in San Francisco government.

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: Adrienne Hoyer
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 25, 2025 12:13:22 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: Adrienne Hoyer

Email: amhoyer@sbcglobal.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: Thomas Bernard
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: Monday, July 28, 2025 6:24:36 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: Thomas Bernard

Email: bernardtr@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.

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: sherry archer
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: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 2:28:34 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: sherry archer

Email: sherry.archer88@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.

At a time when the city is working toward a sustainable balanced budget, SFMTA is one department that was supposed to be self-funding but actually runs at a deficit. Using their budget to fund

advocacy groups only compounds the deficit problem. Passing advocacy funds through a city department prevents transparency and accountability.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,
Sherry Archer

From: Mark Sackett
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 31, 2025 4:56:25 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: Mark Sackett

Email: MSackett@Reflectur.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: Shelley Harrison
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 5:20:28 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	Shelley Harrison
Email	shelleyhsf@gmail.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: John McNamara
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 5:21:29 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	John McNamara
Email	mcnamara229@hotmail.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Josie Lucchesi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 5:28:30 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	Josie Lucchesi
Email	josinsf@yahoo.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 5:29:25 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	Hatun Noguera
Email	noguera@changes.world
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Calum MacKay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 5:38:20 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	Calum MacKay
Email	calumlmackay@gmail.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: David Joa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 5:57:27 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	David Joa
Email	Senorjoa@gmail.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Tami Epstein
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 5:59:30 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: Tami Epstein

Email: tl.epstein@yahoo.com

Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors,

It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts.

This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust.

San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy.

We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts.

Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Sharon Handa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 6:02:25 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	Sharon Handa
Email	shandaf7@yahoo.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Karina Velasquez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 6:03:32 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	Karina Velasquez
Email	karinawinder@gmail.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Frances Tom
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 6:06:24 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: Frances Tom

Email: barnybgl@pacbell.net

Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors,

It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts.

This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust.

San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy.

We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts.

Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: john lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 6:20:33 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	john lee
Email	john.ele81946@gmail.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Tiffany Waugh
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 6:47:20 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	Tiffany Waugh
Email	blocker.90.network@icloud.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Jay yang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 7:43:23 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	Jay yang
Email	jnyang14@gmail.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Maria Nowicki
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 7:53:25 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: Maria Nowicki

Email: mnowicki45@yahoo.com

Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors,

It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts.

This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust.

San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy.

We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts.

Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Douglas Frantz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 8:18:26 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	Douglas Frantz
Email	douglasfrantz@gmail.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Vanessa Pacheco
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 8:56:28 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	Vanessa Pacheco
Email	vanessalp@sbcglobal.net
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Lucy Ho
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Saturday, August 2, 2025 3:03:24 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	Lucy Ho
Email	LucyHo888@gmail.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Ronald Mungai
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Saturday, August 2, 2025 3:21:24 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	Ronald Mungai
Email	limo4usf@gmail.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Iris Bucchioni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Saturday, August 2, 2025 10:22:28 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	Iris Bucchioni
Email	irismvbucchioni@yahoo.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds. Thank you,

Iris Bucchioni

From: Lorenzo DiCarlo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Saturday, August 2, 2025 1:47:26 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	Lorenzo DiCarlo
Email	ladicarlo@gmail.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Shirley Fogarino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Saturday, August 2, 2025 3:09:24 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	Shirley Fogarino
Email	scoopfoggy@prodigy.net
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Diane Sargent
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Saturday, August 2, 2025 8:46:27 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	Diane Sargent
Email	diane.sargent@gmail.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds. Thank you

Diane

From: Marina Dee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Saturday, August 2, 2025 9:05:35 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	Marina Dee
Email	jazmin1557@aol.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Richard Adhikari
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Sunday, August 3, 2025 12:45:20 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	Richard Adhikari
Email	planner.filler-6r@icloud.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Elizabeth Shaw
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Sunday, August 3, 2025 1:44:24 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	Elizabeth Shaw
Email	littliz@aol.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Morgan Weiss
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Monday, August 4, 2025 4:55:24 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	Morgan Weiss
Email	manduin@pacbell.net
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Kristap Baltin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Date: Thursday, August 7, 2025 11:05:33 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	Kristap Baltin
Email	kbaltin@yahoo.com
Subject	Stop City Funds from Fueling Lobbying
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members, and Board of Supervisors, It is concerning that the City continues to fund nonprofit organizations that use those same funds to influence public policy by lobbying the agencies that awarded them contracts. This creates an inherent conflict of interest, allowing taxpayer dollars to indirectly support advocacy efforts without clear oversight or accountability. City contracts should serve the public interest, not subsidize organizations that also act as political actors within City Hall. When service providers are also lobbying decision-makers, it compromises transparency and public trust. San Franciscans deserve a government that uses public funds responsibly and avoids arrangements that blur the line between governance and advocacy. We urge you to support this ordinance and end the practice of using public funds to indirectly support lobbying efforts. Promote transparency. Restore trust. Protect public funds.

From: Tony Fox
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: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 7:26:26 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: Tony Fox

Email: sftonyfox@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: Michael Murano
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: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 8:25:30 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: Michael Murano

Email: mmurano@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: Christina Pappas
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: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 8:41:32 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: Christina Pappas

Email: scoutca66@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: Aaron Vanian
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: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 10:28:26 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: Aaron Vanian

Email: aaronvanian@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: Barbara J Dwyer
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: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:15:36 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: Barbara J Dwyer

Email: montereydivingwoman@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: PATIENCE HUTCHINSON
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, August 13, 2025 1:57:24 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: PATIENCE HUTCHINSON

Email: knit1purl1@sbcglobal.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: Mari Murayama
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, August 13, 2025 6:23:28 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: Mari Murayama

Email: mdmurayama@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,

Mari Murayama
District 1

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, August 13, 2025 6:56:37 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: 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: Mitchell Smith
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, August 13, 2025 7:57:20 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: Mitchell Smith

Email: htimsm1@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 disturbing that the SFGov still 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: Brandon Lee
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, August 13, 2025 5:04:35 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: Brandon Lee

Email: blews10@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 Davis
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, August 15, 2025 2:30:28 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: John Davis

Email: crabit7@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: Robert Heisler
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, August 20, 2025 10:01:22 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: Robert Heisler

Email: carobikam@duck.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.

Are these groups using their member's voting power and endorsements to sway city and elected officials to do their bidding, their huge subsidies for example? If these groups confined their efforts to their stated

mission and not, as an organization, delve into issues not related to their purpose, I could see reasonable city support. But not when they use their political power to completely change city policies not within their organizational goals.

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,

Item 68

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)
Subject:	FW: Restore remote public comment at Board of Supervisors committee meetings! File No. 241048
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 1:45:43 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Michelle Gurlin regarding:

> File No. 241048 - Motion amending the Board of Supervisors' Rules of Order by revising Rule 1.3.3 (In-Person and Remote Public Comment) to provide for remote public comment opportunities for members of the public at committee meetings of the Board.

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: Michelle Gurlin <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2025 3:20 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Restore remote public comment at Board of Supervisors committee meetings!

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to SUPPORT the measure to restore remote public comment at Board of Supervisors committee meetings in San Francisco. After former Supervisor Peskin proposed such a measure last fall (File #241048), the matter unfortunately did not make it to a vote before the end of the year. We need one or more members of the Board of Supervisors to take up sponsorship again, and for the rest of the Board to support it.

Remote public comment is crucial in allowing constituents to provide meaningful, real-time feedback on decisions that will affect us and our communities. There are myriad reasons why so many of us can't make it in person in the middle of the day to City Hall to give a public comment, even when the outcome of the decisions the Board is making will impact us greatly. Many people can't take the time off work, or need to be present as a parent or caregiver for family or other loved ones. Many people don't have reliable transportation, or can't afford to risk COVID/Flu and other illnesses in an indoor poorly ventilated environment where so few people are wearing masks. Remote public comment makes democracy more accessible and increases digital inclusion for the residents of this city, who you represent.

We urge you to SUPPORT access to democratic participation for ALL, especially those most disenfranchised and marginalized in our city, who have been historically left out of the political process. Please listen to our broad coalition of San Franciscans, and invest in democracy by supporting remote public comment.

Michelle Gurlin
mspark3333@aol.com
3380 Adeline St
Berkeley, California 94703

Item 69

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)
Subject:	CA SB 63 - 3 letters
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 1:50:35 PM
Attachments:	3 letters SB 63.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 3 letters, from members of the public, regarding California State Senate Bill 63 (Wiener, Arreguín), relating to transportation funding.

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.*

Item 70

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)
Subject:	protected bikeway on Valencia Street - 2 letters
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 1:53:54 PM
Attachments:	2 letters Valencia Protected Bike Lanes.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 letters from members of the public regarding the installation of a protected bikeway on Valencia Street south of 23rd Street.

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:	Eric Gregory
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
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...
Date:	Thursday, July 31, 2025 10:28:20 PM

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,

Eric Gregory
mrericsir@gmail.com
255 Dolores St #3
San Francisco, California 94103

From:	Michael Fox
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please install protected bike lanes on Arguello Boulevard immediately alongside other sustainable transportation infrastructure improvements...
Date:	Saturday, August 9, 2025 1:09:07 AM

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 support the installation of protected bike lanes on Arguello Boulevard between Fulton Street and Washington Boulevard immediately, alongside other sustainable transportation infrastructure improvements. Protected bike lanes are proven to increase safety for all people, including drivers and especially people on bikes, and will help San Francisco address our roadway safety crisis and the climate crisis while moving the City towards its goals for Vision Zero and sustainable mode share.

The tragic death of USA Cycling champion Ethan Boyes and the critical injury of a 16-year-old boy on Arguello Boulevard are a stark reminder of what can — and will — happen on streets without protected bike lanes and why we need to install protected bike lanes across our city to reduce roadway deaths, car traffic, and pollution and increase sustainable mode share and climate action.

I urge you to support the installation of protected bike lanes and other sustainable transportation infrastructure improvements on Arguello Boulevard and do everything within your power to ensure these improvements are installed immediately.

Thank you,

Michael Fox
mfox1@usfca.edu
220 GELLERT DR, San Francisco, CA 941432
San Francisco, California 94132

Item 71

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:	Letter regarding the Closure of the Great Highway
Date:	Tuesday, August 12, 2025 1:43:00 PM
Attachments:	Great Highway.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for a letter from a member of the public regarding the closure of the Great Highway.

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

TO THE FOUR ASSINE MORONS RESPONSIBLE FOR PUTTING PROPOSITION K ON THE
BALLOT TO PERMANTLY CLOSE THE UPPER GREAT HIGHWAY TO CARS,

ALL FOUR OF YOU ARE DESPICABLE !!!!

ALL FOUR OF YOU SHOULD BE ASHAMED OF YOURSELVES..

THE PERMANENT CLOSER OF THE UPPER GREAT HIGHWAY TO CARS HAS RESULTED IN INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND POLLUTION ON THE LOWER GREAT HIGHWAY AND ALL THE SIDE STREETS.. NOT TO MENTION SUNSET BLVD.. AND NINETEENTH AVE..

THE UPPER GREAT HIGHWAY MUST REMAIN OPEN TO CARS 24 HOURS A DAY,, 7 DAYS A WEEK, AND 365 DAYS A YEAR.. THE UPPER GREAT HIGHWAY SHOULD BE CLOSED ONLY FOR SAND REMOVAL!!!..

AN ATTORNEY HAS FILED A LAWSUIT STATING THAT THE PERMANENT CLOSER OF THE UPPER GREAT HIGHWAY TO CARS IS ILLEAGLE!!!!..

A JUDGE WILL DECIDE ON THE LAWSUIT IN EARLY SEPTEMBER..
A SPECIAL ELECTION WILL BE HELD A WEEK LATER..
ALL FOUR OF YOU CAN REST ASSURED THAT I WILL BE VOTING YES!!!! ON PROPASTION A..

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 AUG 12 PM 01:32
BOS-11

FFFH p

f

f

OL,,LLGGDD !!!

hhhhhhHhH

uuuhhhh

hhhhhhhhhhh

hhutyhgHhfgfgfgg lettera 22.. the favored typewriter of Fidel

fcastro. Cormac McACthy also hhhh

hhh my ame

hi aleena how are you

this i a type write jjw jkl ojljill yiyjiilsj

ta kmk m j fbnnnshnnshhheyyyriiiijust thisisa j ushjjjjj

hhhh hhh .!!!

hhhhhuuuuuuuuyyyyyhhhhhhHhhh

hhhhhhhh½qpwowiwueyetr=-0 928373645hhh

hhhhhhHhhh

!!!

jeanniehhhhh

hhhgggTTTT jjjjhhhyy

The quick brown fox jumps over the lszy dog. kaaRRROOFFccGDY

ii TTTT 8

See Other Side

Item 72

From: Christopher Johnston
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: Monday, August 18, 2025 1:30:55 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___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo4NmM0MmMxMmQ4ZWFlYjg4MzMxMTQyYWNiYTU0Yjk4ODo3OmQ3MzU6OWU3ZWY2NDcyZjQ2ZDA4NTY1NjgwMzIzOTI0YTEzNmZlNzBkOTkwMjViMGU3NWMzMTg2MjA4MjJhOWQ4MTk1Yjp0OlQ6Tg.

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.

Christopher Johnston
cjohnston617@gmail.com
785 Brannan Street
San Francisco, California 94103

Item 73

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)
Subject: FW: SFZoo Panda Plan
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 11:25:44 AM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Kim Forwood regarding:

File No. 240415 (Resolution No. 304-24) - Resolution authorizing the Office of the Mayor, Recreation and Park Department, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, San Francisco International Airport, Office of the City Administrator, and the Chief of Protocol to solicit donations from various private entities and organizations to support San Francisco in hosting Panda Bears from the People's Republic of China, notwithstanding the Behested Payment Ordinance.

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.

-----Original Message-----
From: leo811 (kim) <leo811sf@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 7:10 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: SFZoo Panda Plan

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

Hello Board of Supervisors,

Hopefully you have not bypassed my previous emails, linking my blog related posts, trying to educate you on Our Zoo, as well on the situation regarding acquiring Pandas which this correspondence is specifically about.

This is my blog post from this weekend. It unpacks comments made by Mayor Lurie, Supervisor Melgar, and Supervisor Chan.

Also please give attention to the two links atbthe bottom of this post. They in short shine a bright light on what will happen if you continue to support bringing Pandas to Our Zoo.

Thank you
Kim Forwood
SF Native & Lifelong Resident

*Unaware Mayor & Officials Still Pushing For Pandas - Unpacking Director's Resignation Media Attention Pt Three ... 8.23.25

https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://iamnotananteater.blogspot.com/2025/08/unaware-mayor-officials-still-pushing.html___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiNDk5NWI3MmZiZDAwMTY4YTI3OTY1MGM1MDFmMzUyMTo3OjRhNmE6NTJhYTk2YmZiYzBkOWVlZmUzMmFhZTUxOGU5NDMwNmQwYjAyZTUyNDc2ZjBhNTdhZmEyNGI5YmJhYjY0NTEyMTpwOlQ6Tg

Item 74

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)
Subject:	File No. 240967 e-Bikes 2 letters
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 11:36:50 AM
Attachments:	2 Letters ebikes.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached for two letters from members of the public regarding:

> File No. 240967, Ordinance No., 268-24: 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.

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: Christopher Johnston
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: Monday, August 18, 2025 1:30:55 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___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo4NmM0MmMxMmQ4ZWFlYjg4MzMxMTQyYWNiYTU0Yjk4ODo3OmQ3MzU6OWU3ZWY2NDcyZjQ2ZDA4NTY1NjgwMzIzOTI0YTEzNmZlNzBkOTkwMjViMGU3NWMzMTg2MjA4MjJhOWQ4MTk1Yjp0OlQ6Tg.

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.

Christopher Johnston
cjohnston617@gmail.com
785 Brannan Street
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Riley Chon
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: Saturday, August 23, 2025 11:07:23 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___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzowNjEyNzBhNzNiOTZkMzY0OTgyOGY0NjVkMzYzY2Q3MDo3OjImMzY6Mml1YWM1YzA5OTAwYjE0MzVkMWMzNTE0N2QzMGMyYzZmYTE3YmVlNzkzMWM0OTIyMGIwOTYyMGM0YTAwNjc4MTp0OlQ6Tg.

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.

Riley Chon
rileyechon@gmail.com
201 Folsom Street, Unit 15A
San Francisco, California 94105

Item 75

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)
Subject:	Carmel Spruell - 2 letters
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 11:50:49 AM
Attachments:	Carmel Spruell 2 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached two letters from Carmel Spruell regarding various subjects.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board – Operations Division
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-7709 | Fax (415) 554-5163
richard.lagunte@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: Cash Money
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Complaints from 2017-2025 Carmel Spruell Jr
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 7:55:37 AM
Attachments: Screenshot_20250820-095317.png

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

Dep 11 #160315525516
PW 053114

Trustees of the state bar of California
Beniece Quirino, bquirino@gmail.com
Case#23009697 Case#23019727
I Carmel B Spruell has made complaints against state bar attorneys and also private attorneys and conflict attorneys since 2017-2025 for my Cps cases and also criminal cases to the court commission, state bar, trustees, bored of supervisors, consumer complaints, General attorneys office, David chiu, [redacted] Mayor, Gavin newsome, Brandon E. Riley all of these people done nothing to help me get my children back nor help me get my criminal cases dropped as well the only thing thats changing is the DA's, judges, attorneys, that's it through 2017-2025
ACLU people as well
Civil rights 9:00AM
division as well Carmel Spruell
they all turned their 08-18-2025
backs on me NAACP People as well
Rob Bonta as well did nothing
Board of supervisors as well did nothing
all coverd their dirt up 2017-2025

From: Cash Money
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Court commission complaint
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 8:27:23 AM
Attachments: Screenshot_20250820-102418.png
Screenshot_20250820-102403.png

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

Complainant 1

Your name

Carmel B Spruell

Your pronouns (e.g., he/him; she/her; they/them)

She

Your email

ladyladyblack23@gmail.com

Your telephone number

(415) 452-3423

Your address

505 Dowden Rd unit D2, Wolfforth, Texas 79382

Your attorney (if any)

Attorney 1

Your attorney's name

Berenice Quirino

Your attorney's email

bquirino.esq@gmail.com

COMPLAINT ABOUT A CALIFORNIA JUDGE, COURT COMMISSIONER OR REFEREE

Confidential under California Constitution Article VI, Section 18, and Commission Rule 102

For instructions on filling out and submitting this form, please visit the commission's Online Complaint Instructions webpage.

Date Submitted

8/20/2025 10:23 AM

Entry Number

11,735

* Indicates a required field

Your information

Complainant 1

Your name

Carmel B Spruell

Item 76

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)
Subject:	SB 79 File No. 250727 - 240 letters
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 2:09:21 PM
Attachments:	340 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 340 letters from members of the public regarding:

> File No. 250727 - Resolution opposing California State Senate Bill No. 79, Housing Development: Transit-Oriented Development, introduced by Senator Scott Wiener, and similar future legislation, unless amended to give Local governments adequate ability to formulate local plans through its local legislative process, in which local governments and residents have adequate review and oversight of community planning, including affordability requirements, and residential and commercial tenant protections.

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: madrider317@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Jordan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:28:22 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Thomas Jordan
8234 Saint Clair Ave North Hollywood, CA 91605-1327

From:	brookesampson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brooke Sampson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:28:28 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Brooke Sampson
2645 Filbert St San Francisco, CA 94123-3215

From: taaronson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tim Aaronson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:37:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Stop destroying what is left of California by facilitating ever more growth.

"Growth for the sake of growth is the ideology of the cancer cell." — Edward Abbey

Sincerely,
Tim Aaronson
706 Balra Dr El Cerrito, CA 94530-3303

From: connieb.contact@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Connie Biaggini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:38:30 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

For pity sakes!!!! Stop this madness. Absolutely you must vote NO on SB 79. We are a city that has zoning laws that are good for our city. Do not let Scott Weiner negate all that our city has done from the days when Alan Duskin fought for our city. It is we, our residents, that know that what we have had is the best for keeping our city that attracts people, that people want to visit with our own regulations that keep us being best served. Think Paris, France and it's adherence to zoning heights that have preserved it as a beautiful city, and never, ever, let us fall into a Manhattan.

We do not need, want, nor is it ever advisable to have the state interfering with our regulations for they can only be responding to monied interest and people to keep their positions in government. It is our city that knows what is best for us, for they are acting in our best interests for it is we, the people, that they are responsible to.

SB 79 is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Connie Biaggini
2639 Filbert St San Francisco, CA 94123-3215

From: designangles@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of L Chow
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79 -- not a housing solution
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:39:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It has been stated for quite some time that California needs more housing on the premise of the increasing unhoused population. That includes San Francisco, however interviews with unhoused people state their reason to live on the streets is affordability, that is lack of enough income to afford the market rate rental units. Although the SF Planning Commission spent a year or more to develop a plan to meet the 82,000 new housing units requirement by 2031; it was developed without input from property owners and the community. The SF Planning Commission's (SFPC) map of upzoned buildings devalue existing properties (e.g., loss of views, access, income and more).

In addition, obtaining and retaining fire and liability insurance is the latest obstacle in California. Insurance companies are reluctant to insure high density buildings and/or the density of already insured property customers in specific areas, which makes obtaining insurance much more difficult, especially landlord protections policies.

The SFPC's plan is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers and billionaire investors that fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements. Moreover, their plan does not include provisions for the infrastructure, schools, emergency services, or public transit upgrades required to support such dramatic density increases. It also fails to address sustainability, tree canopy, or the carbon cost of demolition and new construction.

On the other hand, the financial district has many empty or underused buildings. Although some companies are mandating their employees return to the office, generally that is for a few days a week such that they no longer need the large spaces they leased prior to the Covid 19 pandemic. San Francisco ought to seriously consider converting those buildings, including underused hotels, since there already is existing infrastructure of plumbing, electricity, and even parking garages for some buildings. Since former Mayor Breed proposed the idea, across the country architects, engineers, and developers have assessed and developed conversions as viable. Rather than loose property tax dollars when vacant buildings currently sell for less than 50% or more of the previous purchase value prices, conversions are potentially added-property value buildings; thus, increasing the City's tax base.

In addition, since 2020, the San Francisco population continues to decline. Consider reviewing if the housing element of 82,000 is realistic in late 2025.

Please stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
L Chow
875 California St San Francisco, CA 94108-2301

From:	girisnicholson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Geraldine Nicholson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:40:49 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

DO THE RIGHT THING! Stand against greed! Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: I already don't care very much about visiting San Francisco due to traffic, expensive parking, homelessness, garbage on the streets… having to look at high rises everywhere would make it even more unappealing.

Sincerely,
Geraldine Nicholson
5756 63rd St Sacramento, CA 95824-1926

From: loebtmc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Pat Loeb
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:42:03 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

I am completely frustrated by yet another "cart before the horse" initiative sent my rich, entitled politicians who have no idea what we rank and file have to do to travel to and from work.
Altho I take public transportation whenever I can, and I live along a transit route in Los Angeles, it is almost useless for me. Because transit doesn't run 24/7, nor does it go anywhere that isn't a main street, In a city where 9-5 is not the norm, it is absurd to imagine being able to use public transit built for those with a
9-5 schedule.
Until this is fixed, removing parking and all the other common sense building requirements is just making a bad situation even worse.
And until my legislators try to do their work solely on public transit, it's not fair for them to ask us to do the same.
And no, taking a bike to and from work is neither practical nor an option.
Thank you for paying attention to us regular folks instead of the very rich who are trying to push this through.

Sincerely,
Pat Loeb
1420 S Sierra Bonita Ave Los Angeles, CA 90019-3924

From: scoopfoggy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shirley Fogarino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:42:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Not all transit hubs contain the infrastructure to adequately support 8 and 14 story buildings. SB79 is a push through at all costs with no concern for environment, infrastructure and traffic congestion, to name a few. My family and I live on US101, a highly used, over polluted, noisy, congested, strip. Many structures even now are built along the Lombard corridor on liquefaction zones. In many instances, building basements also flood in winter. No one has thought out the consequences of passing bill after bill after bill which favor billionaire developers with no other consideration! Stop this now. Go back to the drawing board and create a well lthought out plan with community input.

Sincerely,
Shirley Fogarino
1787 Lombard St San Francisco, CA 94123-2907

From: tvobsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anthony Villa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:43:08 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Anthony Villa
4447 Kirkham St San Francisco, CA 94122-2807

From: demariastef@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of stephanie de maria
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:45:35 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

How about filling the thousands of empty apartments and offices with section 8 housing to start

Sincerely,
stephanie de maria
2230 Mason St Apt 302 San Francisco, CA 94133-1882

From: mabsuz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mable Kum
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:51:22 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
Keep residential single family home in our community neighborhoods.
We do not have the resources for such obscure tall buildings in San Francisco as a whole!
Plus where is the data that actually support the need for all these outrageous bulid? Support for affordable not high priced market rate prices!

Sincerely,
Mable Kum
2431 San Francisco, CA 94116

From: ratt57@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Doug McKirahan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:54:37 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Doug McKirahan
5050 Fulton St Apt 202 San Francisco, CA 94121-3666

From: henree_weiner@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Henrietta Weiner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:54:46 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

I do not support the HIGH-RISE buildings to dot our beautiful, unique City of SF.
No to SB 79.

Henrietta Weiner
Dolores Heights Resident

Sincerely,
Henrietta Weiner
700 Church St Apt 101 San Francisco, CA 94114-3001

From:	broazen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bernard Roazen
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:57:18 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

My home is directly behind an upzoned area and if an old apartment house were to be demolished I could have a gigantic new 85 foot building blocking my light.

Sincerely,
Bernard Roazen
135 Magellan Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-1416

From: mariemosher@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MARGARET MOSHER
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 5:11:33 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
MARGARET MOSHER
3548 18th St San Francisco, CA 94110-1678

From: patinas_bales9k@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Valerie Keech
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 5:11:34 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: I am against this because adequate parking is not required of developers.

Sincerely,
Valerie Keech
PO Box 1663 San Bruno, CA 94066-7663

From: l_puccini@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Puccini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 5:16:11 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Laura Puccini
2650 35th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-2812

From: john.nulty@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 5:21:25 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
John Nulty
PO Box 421949 San Francisco, CA 94142-1949

From:	celestehong13@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Celeste Hong
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 5:32:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Celeste Hong
4758 Cromwell Ave Los Angeles, CA 90027-1144

From: lnpoole@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lys Poole
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 5:34:28 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Lys Poole
1975 4th St San Francisco, CA 94143-2351

From: tamrob@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tamra Marshall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 5:34:52 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

I'd like real housing solutions that actually help our people with middle class to lower incomes stay in the city. We've got to get the focus off developers needs and put our focus on solutions that serve our working class needs. I've heard very little to nothing about how to be sure the neighborhood infrastructure and services will match all these potential new residents. Prioritize small businesses and community services right along with addressing new homes and apartments - not high rises with only a few "affordable" apartments. We can find better solutions to growing San Francisco Housing needs and keep the integrity, charm, and architecture of this world-class city. No to long corridors of high rise buildings - who will it really serve, besides the politicians?

Sincerely,
Tamra Marshall
3609 21st St San Francisco, CA 94114-2912

From: john.decock@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John DeCock
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 5:54:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
John DeCock
3789 Market St San Francisco, CA 94131-1340

From:	cristal_parsons@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cristal Parsons
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 6:28:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Cristal Parsons
2125 Leavenworth St San Francisco, CA 94133-2519

From: gt40@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Hoyt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 6:43:11 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
John Hoyt
4625 Lawler Ct La Mesa, CA 91941-5625

From: jamiespiral55@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jamie S.
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 7:03:18 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
Having been born in San Francisco in 1955, as well as my father in 1925, I realize some changes have been necessary to house San Franciscans in the past but unnecessarily forcing building when there are thousands of empty flats, apartments and unoccupied business buildings is unconscionable. To obliterate sunshine by building for profit 7-15 story buildings along neighborhood corridors in our foggy city is mindless and in disregard for all who cherish our charming San Francisco neighbors. Additionally ground floor businesses suffered greatly because of the Pandemic, and they will suffer severely if building along transit corridors occurs. NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Jamie S.
463 22nd Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-3013

From: sihrley.yuen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shirley Yuen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 7:05:23 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

I don't want my neighborhood overshadowed by high rises. There is already a lack of parking on the streets. More density will mean no parking. I am against allowing upzoning of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Shirley Yuen
2307 16th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-2505

From:	mary.duprey@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Duprey
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 7:18:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Mary Duprey
420 Pico Blvd Apt 102 Santa Monica, CA 90405-1156

From: awawd@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ansel Wettersten
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 7:48:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Ansel Wettersten
3 Leroy Pl San Francisco, CA 94109-4224

From: marilyn.mm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marilyn Miller
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: PLEASE Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 7:56:43 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: there has to be a better solution to help people with affordable housing if we would take the time and effort to look into the situation more thoroughly.

Please vote no on Senate bill 79

Thank you so much

Sincerely,
Marilyn Miller
107 Westridge Dr Portola Valley, CA 94028-7712

From: lehr.david@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dave Lehr
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 7:58:42 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors, Planning Commission Members and Government Leaders,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

SB 79 is not wanted by me, or by most of the voters and residents of San Francisco!

Thank you!

Sincerely,
Dave Lehr
1380 Francisco St San Francisco, CA 94123-2306

From: powkatz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of J Powell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 8:34:46 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Demolition of rent-controlled units would be devastating for the majority of San Francisco residents. Businesses would be displaced and may not survive a move. The character of the City that attracts tourists will be diminished, hurting the local economy.

Please Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
J Powell
2 Whiting St Apt 1 San Francisco, CA 94133-2443

From: ftblote@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Francine Lofrano
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 8:35:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement and ruining quality of life in long established neighborhoods.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to activists & developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79!!!!!

Stop the war on single family homes and neighborhoods! Leave our neighborhoods alone!!!

Sincerely,
Francine Lofrano
29 Westwood Dr San Francisco, CA 94112-1219

From: janebregman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane Bregman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 8:47:25 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Jane Bregman
3436 Divisadero St San Francisco, CA 94123-1908

From: dkcroker@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of david croker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 8:58:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

As a San Francisco resident of 63 years, it breaks my heart to see so much destroyed for so few.

Sincerely,
david croker
642 Broderick St San Francisco, CA 94117-1412

From: eturner@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Edward Turner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 9:07:49 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Edward Turner
15232 Stratford Ct Monte Sereno, CA 95030-2125

From: bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 9:11:49 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

It feels like we haven't learned lessons from the Fillmore displacement or attempts to move the freeways into communities.

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
1946 Grove St Apt 6 San Francisco, CA 94117-1149

From:	lawrencegrassedonio@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lawrence Grassedonio
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 9:22:03 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Lawrence Grassedonio
902 N Kemp St Burbank, CA 91505-2721

From: elemjw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lin Joe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 9:51:30 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

I have lived in San Francisco for over 40 years and have raised my children here. They also currently reside here and are raising their families in the City.

It is sad and disconcerting to think of the consequences that we will have i.e., unprecedented development and displacement if this SB79 passes. My Family, Neighbors and I request your NO vote on SB79.

Sincerely,
Lin Joe
1414 24th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-3312

From:	sf.lorna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorna Walker
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 10:04:19 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: Please don't buy into the Yes I'Ma BullY lies. Trickle down housing doesn't work and this is just a land grab by billionaire developers. Save our State and City!

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker
2351 Bush St San Francisco, CA 94115-3123

From: dpj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Devon Johnson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 10:08:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Devon Johnson
3065 Buchanan St San Francisco, CA 94123-4201

From: marthagw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Martha Graham-Waldon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 10:33:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Martha Graham-Waldon
9501 E Zayante Rd Felton, CA 95018-9094

From: Skipsworld12@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dale Dubrin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 10:36:55 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Dale Dubrin
772 Spruce Ave Pacific Grove, CA 93950-4045

From:	askalice@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Polesky
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 10:40:59 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Alice Polesky
890 Kansas St Apt 4 San Francisco, CA 94107-2664

From:	wrthoma@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Walter Thoma
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 11:24:56 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Walter Thoma
525 Munich St San Francisco, CA 94112-3550

From: janscatt13@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of JANICE Scattini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 6:42:18 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
Please wake up and fight for San Francisco!

Sincerely,
JANICE Scattini
2060 Union St Ph 7 San Francisco, CA 94123-4101

From: carolmoore1234@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol Moore
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 7:09:41 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
High density actually concentrates wealth and decreases home ownership without providing affordable housing. We need to reverse this trend. Please consider carefully and vote NO on SB 79

Sincerely,
Carol Moore
3399 Punta Alta Unit A Laguna Woods, CA 92637-0210

From: wash@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol Osorio
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 8:47:18 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution!! The SF Bay Area is already too expensive. Building high rise luxury units in cities that provide good mass transit is punishing them for good transportation option. If this passes cities will be incentivised against increasing public transportation. The coast will become accessible to only the rich.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements. I used to live among a great number of creatives. People who made SF a unique and interesting place. Today, nearly every musician or artist has been forced out of the city. The 'city' is becoming more of a burb than the suburbs!! Why visit SF it is a bore and ghost town.

Please, do not sell out CA to speculation! Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Carol Osorio
1844 Market St Unit 207 San Francisco, CA 94102-6288

From: dlumaghi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dick Lumaghi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Vote NO on SB 79
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 8:48:07 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

As presently written, SB 79 mandates that when a rent controlled building is demolished, whatever is rebuilt on the property LOSES rent control status. This looks to me like a power grab from the developers.

Sincerely,
Dick Lumaghi
2060 Stockton St San Francisco, CA 94133-2026

From: gcostales@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Georgina Costales
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 8:52:08 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Georgina Costales
1611 48th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-2803

From: maryanntittle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MaryAnn Tittle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 10:28:21 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
MaryAnn Tittle
11670 Buckwheat Rd Phelan, CA 92371-4127

From: susan_keyes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Keyes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 10:49:55 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution. It's a plan that will dislocate many people in our communities and allow developers to build unsightly buildings that most people won't be able to afford.

I am in favor of increasing the supply of affordable housing, but this legislation will not accomplish that goal. Instead, it is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

I voted for Mayor Lurie, and for Senator Wiener, but if this bill passes I will very much regret those votes, and they will not have my support in the future.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Susan Keyes
1940 Vallejo St Apt 4 San Francisco, CA 94123-4974

From: ljshaffer1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Shaffer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 11:01:16 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

San Francisco, like much of CA, needs more AFFORDABLE HOUSING. Those who believe in a "trickle down" model of the housing market -- that building more housing in general will somehow lead to large numbers of previously occupied housing units becoming affordable -- are either deluded or know they are lying. Affordable housing must be created and built as affordable housing. I see no evidence that SB 79 is designed to do that.

Dr. Linda J. Shaffer, PhD Economics, Northwestern University

Sincerely,
Linda Shaffer
855 La Playa St Apt 459 San Francisco, CA 94121-3255

From: dongaj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Albert Dong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 11:10:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: FYI, I have been a supporter of most of you, if not all of you in the past. I'm not usually a single issue voter, but regarding this particular matter I would definitely find cause to support other candidates in the future, who would Vote No on SB 79. It seems to me that there are many Californians that resent state imposition of housing mandates on local communities, depriving them of local control. Please listen and pay attention to all of your constituents.

Sincerely,
Albert Dong
3030 Broderick St Apt 7 San Francisco, CA 94123-3281

From: naomi.barulich@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Naomi Barulich
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79! It's a lie!
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 11:43:31 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: when will the money grubbers stop? Our neighborhoods are too precious to sell out. Affordability? Yeah, right.

Sincerely,
Naomi Barulich
2478 26th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-2301

From: gregorystevensw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gregory Stevens
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:20:11 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Gregory Stevens
277 19th Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-2302

From: ho.robt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Ho
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:23:00 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Robert Ho
95 Cerritos Ave San Francisco, CA 94127-2703

From: rbrandi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of richard brandi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:23:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
richard brandi
125 Dorchester Way San Francisco, CA 94127-1109

From: barbara.barbhand@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Handler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:23:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Barbara Handler
177 Coleridge St San Francisco, CA 94110-5112

From: marc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marc Meyer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:26:52 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

400+ pages of regulations even RIch Hillis and the supes don't really understand, all based on the premise that it makes sense to offer developers a fee-out of affordable housing requirements at $250 sf, when the city builds at $400+ and developers will just choose between the housing option and the state density bonus on a one off basis depending what's good for them, which in high value zones will always be to build higher. So much wrong with this bill.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Marc Meyer
1000 Chestnut St Apt 9B San Francisco, CA 94109-1216

From: barbara@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Mann
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:28:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

We DO NOT NEED MORE EMPTY LUXURY UNITS! Blanket Upzoning is reckless and senseless. We need to fill the current empty luxury units and have more AFFORDABLE HOUSING!!! NOT more "Market-Rate" LUXURY CONDO'S!!!

Sincerely,
Barbara Mann
3467 17th St Apt 2 San Francisco, CA 94110-1165

From: sfneonbook@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Homan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:28:34 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not what San Francisco needs--it's going to ruin neighborhoods that are the heart and soul of the city. Politicians can come up with a better plan!

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Randall Homan
1935 Franklin St San Francisco, CA 94109-3488

From: vance@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of VG Nesbitt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:29:00 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO, SAN FRANCISCO!

Sincerely,
VG Nesbitt
2640 Green St San Francisco, CA 94123-4664

From: sandra.derian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of SANDRA DERIAN
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:31:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: This will displace my building's seniors, low-income residents on rent control, and people with disabilities. Where do you expect them to go when their local services are within a short distance of downtown? I live near CPMC on 1100-1101 Van Ness where I have three doctors and get bloodwork to keep myself healthy. If I were to be displaced, I lose easy walking distance access to my healthcare providers. I have lived in my apartment on Franklin St. since 1994 so suddenly I have to move and with what funds? Or are you going to buyout people to afford to live in a below standard SRO? Rent is astronomically higher than what I currently pay under rent control laws. I cannot afford $3,000/month to have a basic studio apartment. I'm better off than most people who will have to work until I am 75 years old because I don't have retirement income like the billionaires who run tech businesses. After having an income of $80k gross per year, I still cannot afford the cost of living in California if I had to move from a rent-controlled unit.

Sincerely,
SANDRA DERIAN
1415 Franklin St Apt 606 San Francisco, CA 94109-0476

From: tracy_scruggs@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tracy Scruggs
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:33:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please vote no on SB 79. We need housing. We should first get the thousands of vacant units online. We should not compromise the City's promise to provide housing accessibility and affordability by empowering developers. Developers have their own interests and they are not for the greater good or the people who live in Sam Francisco.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Tracy Scruggs
2660 Scott St San Francisco, CA 94123-4635

From:	v.barker@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Virginia Barker
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:37:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: SB 79 and Lurie's Upzoning will be the death of San Francisco. Don't sell our your constituents!

Sincerely,
Virginia Barker
200 Alhambra St Apt 17 San Francisco, CA 94123-2026

From: sjgorskilaw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephen Gorski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:40:22 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

I have lived in D4 since 1981 and have been active in the community and voted in all elections since moving to the Outer Sunset/ Parkside. I want to be involved and not be excluded from the process. I worry that there are ulterior motives in this bill and it needs further investigation.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Stephen Gorski
2366 48th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-2055

From: mlrinsfo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Martha Rudd
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:42:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Put the $ developers pay to not include affordable units in their building to build affordable public housing. I have seen the housing in my neighborhood marketed to the wealthy and not the working class professionals or families.

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Martha Rudd
1654 Filbert St San Francisco, CA 94123-3706

From: noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:42:35 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: San Francsico Is full.

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera Hatun Noguera
942 Teresita Blvd San Francisco, CA 94127-2325

From: timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:44:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
942 Teresita Blvd San Francisco, CA 94127-2325

From: deniselleck@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Denise Selleck
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:45:25 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

I'm a fourth-generation San Franciscan. Please help me stay in this city. Please do not give in to the big real estate interests which will just make San Francisco more unaffordable to low-income people and retirees like me.

Sincerely,
Denise Selleck
1375 45th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-1108

From: janebregman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane Bregman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:45:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: This will totally destroy the ambiance of San Francisco and not solve the housing problems. There are other sound solutions other than the Manhattanization of San Francisco. And most likely the potential developers are from Manhattan.

Sincerely,
Jane Bregman
3436 Divisadero St San Francisco, CA 94123-1908

From: pscruggs@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip Scruggs
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:48:59 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution. It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers and puts our neighborhoods at risk.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Development must be a local issue. We do not want or need radical change in California.

Sincerely,
Philip Scruggs
2660 Scott St San Francisco, CA 94123-4635

From: gb_andrews@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gandhia Andrews
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:52:19 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Gandhia Andrews
5 Diaz Ave San Francisco, CA 94132-2434

From: johnbarkan1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Barkan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:54:08 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: The assault on our Sunset neighborhood begins with 2550 Irving and continues with SB79 which will mean that there is NO zoning restrictions, in effect, for our single family RESIDENTIAL neighborhood.

Sincerely,
John Barkan
1221 27th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-1506

From: jean_allan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jean Allan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:54:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

I am opposed to SB79. If I wanted to live in a mid-to-highrise area within SF, I would not have chosen Noe Valley as my neighborhood. It's absurd to consider the J Church metro line, which has been threatened with cuts and runs infrequently as it is, as some high capacity transportation that warrants upzoning all around the Church Street corridor; the same with 24th Street within this area. ADUs and low-density increases are acceptable, but what is proposed is not. Convert unused office space to housing and build higher in newer areas like SOMA, Mission Bay and Hunters Point. SB79 will destroy what makes SF neighborhoods desirable and livable.

Sincerely,
Jean Allan
132 Vicksburg St San Francisco, CA 94114-3327

From: msmc5354@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of M Chin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:55:12 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

NO on SB 79, which will detrimentally alter what makes San Francisco unique!!

Sincerely,
M Chin
3517 Scott St San Francisco, CA 94123-1506

From: daniellemarone@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Danielle Marone
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:55:21 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
I disagree with the large scale buildings in neighborhoods that are generally single family or houses with an ADU. These neighborhoods cannot handle the density and the infrastructure does not support these large buildings.

Sincerely,
Danielle Marone
2274 45th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-1503

From: jfrazier@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James Frazier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote YES on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:57:18 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SF and California face a housing crisis. We don't have enough. This impacts affordability, homelessness, the climate crisis. There's no good reason to build more housing ESPECIALLY near transit hubs.

We know SF is gridlocked by NIMBYs but goodness gracious, try and do the right thing. Vote yes on SB 79.

Sincerely,
James Frazier
1100 Gough St San Francisco, CA 94109-6607

From: slehman21@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephanie Lehman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:02:52 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Stephanie Lehman
352 Lake St San Francisco, CA 94118-1357

From: ekbcelt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erin Boylan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:03:48 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Erin Boylan
278 1/2 Jersey St San Francisco, CA 94114-3823

From: koelsch1886@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leslie Koelsch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79! Absolutely NO.
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:06:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Leslie Koelsch
197 Corbett Ave San Francisco, CA 94114-1870

From: randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:10:00 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

SB79 would forever change the intimate historical character and scale that makes San Francisco great. Please vote No on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei
2562 21st Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-3013

From: tompacko@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tom Packo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:15:42 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's enablement to destroy many of the things that make cities like San Francisco unique.

It is an unpredictable upzoning bill that hands power to developers, and does not include any real affordability requirements.

Please listen to Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79!

Sincerely,
Tom Packo
2566 Greenwich St San Francisco, CA 94123-3308

From:	shashacooks@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anastasia Yovanopoulos
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:18:10 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Vote NO on SB 79!

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.
Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
3718 24th St San Francisco, CA 94114-3942

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
3718 24th St San Francisco, CA 94114-3942

From: sflronline@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Herbert Mintz II
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:19:44 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live in the Outer Sunset. I have been a resident of District 4 for over 30 years. I am proud to be part of a neighborhood where I know many of the residents. That what is means to be in a community of neighbors.

I'm writing to express my deep concern about Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan. This proposal, which would increase "zoning capacity" to an unprecedented 800,000 housing units, goes far beyond what San Francisco actually needs—and puts our neighborhoods, tenants, and small businesses at risk.

This plan is excessive, unnecessary and counterproductive.

In other words, your plan would wreck the integrity of the place I call home. My neighbors and I would suffer increases in traffic, noise, air pollution and litter. I say a big NO to that.

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Herbert Mintz II
1045 Santiago St San Francisco, CA 94116-1706

From: rhubinsky@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robin Hubinsky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:20:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Robin Hubinsky
44 Mirabel Ave San Francisco, CA 94110-4615

From: daororke@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dennis O"Rorke
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:23:11 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
Politicians, bureaucrats and developers have ruined downtown with an overabundance of ugly, view blocking, shade casting.
wind funneling high rises. Now they are proposing to do the same to the neighborhoods. San Francisco is overbuilt and over crowded.
Please make it your legacy to preserve what charm is left.
Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Dennis O'Rorke
1360 Mcallister St San Francisco, CA 94115-4619

From: sheiladowell@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sheila Dowell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:25:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:This will be the ultimate desecration of San Francisco, if allowed to pass. It does NOT satisfactorily resolve the housing situation.

PLEASE be mindful of the devastating consequences - in so many ways - should this be allowed to pass. Do you really want the desecration of San Francisco to be your legacy?!

Thank you,

Sheila Dowell

Sincerely,
Sheila Dowell
2480 Filbert St San Francisco, CA 94123-3316

From: begumjdin81@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of JAMILAH DIN
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:29:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My husband and I live in the Outer Sunset. We have been residents of District 4 for over 30 years. We are happy here. Due to character of our neighborhood, that is, low density single family homes, we know many of our neighbors. We are able to share good quality information and be of assistance to one another.

That is what it means to live in a neighborhood. It is a livable space where neighbors can get to known one another.

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

This plan is excessive, unnecessary and counterproductive.

In other words, your plan would wreck the integrity of the place I call home. My neighbors and I would suffer increases in traffic, noise, air pollution and litter. That's is not what we want in our neighborhood.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
JAMILAH DIN
1045 Santiago St San Francisco, CA 94116-1706

From: robertmyost@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rob Yost
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:31:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: I live in the Pacific Heights neighborhood of San Francisco, and my wife and I moved here from Rincon Hill to escape the high rise life. We saved for years to buy our current home, which has a beautiful view of the Bay and Alcatraz, and we did so in reliance upon the neighborhood's 40 foot height limit, which is being cast aside on a whim, despite clear opposition from voters and the residents of impacted neighborhoods, to meet outdated housing goals. For a number of reasons, including the potential Manhattanization of our neighborhoods, this entire approach needs to be reconsidered. I'm happy to discuss further concerns and possible alternative approaches with any of you. Please vote No.

Sincerely,
Rob Yost
1930 Jackson St San Francisco, CA 94109-2838

From: ljohns@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lucy Johns
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:32:04 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

*******Stand with SF residents and your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79**********

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the any state legislation that strengthens Mayor Lurie's proposed upzoning plan for District 3 in SF CA.

The upzoning plan has no protections against rent gouging, evictions of tenants and small businesses, or design antithetical to historic neighborhoods. It will drive up rents, displace long-term tenants, push out small businesses, and cause irreparable harm to historic neighborhoods like North Beach, where I am fortunate to live. District 3 residents and countless tourists prize this human-scale, commercially thriving, eminently livable neighborhood. Not the only one like this in SF but certainly a favorite one.

Further, it won't fix the problem of long-stalled housing! See Roland Li in the Chron recently: https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/housing-megaprojects-stalled-20812460.php___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo0ZTJlMTI0ZTBlNTFjOWZlZWNhZTdlOTY5OTI3NjdjOTo3OjY0ZDA6NzNmNjlhMTIyZWIzMDE2ZWQ5OTE4ZTk1MTcxYTA5NjAyZGVjNmIwMzRmMzZiNTgyYWRkOTA3MGRhY2lxYjQ2MzpwOlQ6Tg

CA and SF need more housing. SB 79 is not the way to get it. The state has options for protecting affordability. Let's see some evidence of that before foisting luxury high-rises all over SF and other jurisdictions.

Please vote NO on this legislation that doesn't reflect any demand from any SF residents for what it enables! Thank you!

PS: If you've heard this from me before, forgive the repetition! Can't say it enough. ;-)

Sincerely,
Lucy Johns
561 Greenwich St San Francisco, CA 94133-2949

From: peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:39:53 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Peter Lee
3910 Fulton St San Francisco, CA 94118-3556

From: littliz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elizabeth Shaw
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:41:02 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Please don't disregard the votes of the people in SF.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Shaw
1545 Broadway Apt 308 San Francisco, CA 94109-2533

From: jherrod9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Herrod-Lumsden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:41:53 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
553 A Greenwich St San Francisco, CA 94133-7128

From: katedegnan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathryn Degnan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:42:52 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's neighborhood-charm eradication!

There's been insufficient consideration and documentation of the historic nature of the north beach and telegraph hill neighborhoods. There also been insensitivity to the loss of neighborhood cohesion as buildings are demolished, lots are vacant, and long-time residents - who are the heart and soul of our neighborhoods - ate displaced and lose their homes.

Where are the historical and architectural impact studies and reports? Where are the affordability and replacement units for those displaced? How long is it going to take to evaluate the human costs of these displacements and the degradation of our neighborhoods through the destruction of their historic charm amd character?

Please vote NO on SB 79.

Kathryn Degnan
Owner 341 Union Street
Co-founder of 2 companies in San Francisco

Sincerely,
Kathryn Degnan
341 Union St San Francisco, CA 94133-3515

From: jherrod9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Herrod-Lumsden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:49:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
DON'T LET WIENER, LURIE, SAUTER, AND THE OTHERS MOW DOWN SAN FRANCISCO. IF LOS ANGELES CAN SEE THROUGH THIS GREEDY EVIL AND INANITY, SO SHOULD YOU.

Sincerely,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
553 A Greenwich St San Francisco, CA 94133-7128

From: john.nulty@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:49:41 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
John Nulty
PO Box 421949 San Francisco, CA 94142-1949

From: familyadler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of B Adler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:00:44 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 does not represent the will of the people. It forces policy that we DO NOT want.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Stop the leftist groups and real estate developers who want to ruin San Francisco!

Sincerely,
B Adler
2600 26th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-2907

From: r_bloch@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rene Bloch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:01:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Rene Bloch
2418 41st Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-2117

From: jlzsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Zimrin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:09:21 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Judith Zimrin
1869 Stockton St San Francisco, CA 94133-2900

From: loanhound@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Russell Davis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:10:28 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Increased density will destroy the quality of life in SF. We don't need to be the west coast NYC.

Sincerely,
Russell Davis
29 Lakewood Ave San Francisco, CA 94127-2719

From: amhsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Arthur Hubbard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:16:25 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:I don't believe infrastructure, water, sewer, electric, gas etc and services, fire, police, DPW, transit, parking, etc is adequate at this time to accommodate upzoning. The Great Highway needs to be reopened.

Sincerely,
Arthur Hubbard
751 45th Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-3221

From: natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Natashja Dewolfe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:22:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
225 Irving St San Francisco, CA 94122-2652

From: katheburick@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathe Burick
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:23:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

As a 50 year resident of the Inner Richmond District, i believe this blanket upzoning bill hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements - all of which diminish the quality of life in mt neighborhood..

Stand with not only Your Constituents and but also ALL SF neighborhoods and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Kathe Burick
666 8th Ave Apt 4 San Francisco, CA 94118-3774

From: cutelynx@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Qi Wolf
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:23:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Qi Wolf
1541 Filbert St San Francisco, CA 94123-3787

From: katheburick@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathe Burick
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:27:49 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

As a 50 year resident of the Inner Richmond District, I believe this blanket up-zoning bill hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with not only with Your Constituents but also ALL SF neighborhoods and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Kathe Burick
666 8th Ave Apt 4 San Francisco, CA 94118-3774

From:	awawd@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ansel Wettersten
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:36:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: The city does have need new "Fontanas" the abomination west of Ghirardelli all over the city. There is no guarantee of affordable housing, only the implication without actual facts. Downtown is a wasteland of commercial space that could be converted to housing at less cost than new construction. The developers are not interested because they are just lazy and don't like to think out of the box because the bottom line is more important than housing.

Sincerely,
Ansel Wettersten
3 Leroy Pl San Francisco, CA 94109-4224

From: toodlehead5@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane Alexander
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:39:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Jane Alexander
1635 7th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-3716

From:	richardbullock@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of richard Bullock
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	I have liibed on Tel Hill since 1977. The 40" building height limit should be maintaned to preserve the uniqueness of the neighborrhood.
Date:	Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:40:10 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
richard Bullock
1847 Grant Ave Apt 2 San Francisco, CA 94133-2411

From: carlas@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carla Schlemminger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:41:34 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
I grew up in SF and part of its charm for residents + tourists alike is the approachable scale and neighborhood charm, and sweeping vistas. The number of units SF is required to produce, 82K, is based on SF's pre-Covid population. We're still down a net 40K residents in 2025 so why hasn't that requirement been adjusted?! This is a serious question. Also a good 60K units have already been approved but not built so focus efforts there before suggesting enormous scale for buildings which belong Downtown or SoMa, but NOT in the neighborhoods where more than 6 stories would dwarf anything on the block! SF needs to have a say here otherwise expect major displacement and rampant real estate speculation, not to mention destroying our beloved City!

Sincerely,
Carla Schlemminger
2295 Vallejo St San Francisco, CA 94123-4765

From: smoughan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah Moughan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:41:53 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hi, I am a 30 year resident of San Francisco's District 2 and am saddened and concerned about SB 79. The ability to build 7 or 10 story buildings in our charming, historic neighborhoods is not necessary in order to build housing for people who need it. Please.

Please - Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Sarah Moughan
1900 Vallejo St Apt 405 San Francisco, CA 94123-7907

From: callum@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Callum Hutchins
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:43:08 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Callum Hutchins
2353 Greenwich St San Francisco, CA 94123-3323

From: klschulkin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schulkin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:45:55 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Schulkin
300 Urbano Dr San Francisco, CA 94127-2869

From: hawkweedster@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Monique Koller
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:48:31 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Monique Koller
1360 43rd Ave Unit 441 San Francisco, CA 94122-1283

From: tonychaves@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ANTONIO CHAVES
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:54:52 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
ANTONIO CHAVES
2828 Webster St Apt 5 San Francisco, CA 94123-4019

From: jlansing@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James Lansing
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:56:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
James Lansing
1048 Union St San Francisco, CA 94133-2568

From: jpp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jacob Pearson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please vote NO on SB 79
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:58:02 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

People don’t come to San Francisco for the Manhattan style buildings. They come for the natural beauty, the vistas, the history. Don’t have another Western Addition on your hands. Preserve how unique S.F. is, there is not another city like it and I don’t want it ruined. The city doesn’t need to double in size, utilize the buildings already here. Build on treasure island. Don’t destroy the peace of the western neighborhoods and the rest of the city. Thanks for considering. And otherwise Mayor Lurie, nice work so far. I’m just so against this plan, I had to email.

Sincerely,
Jacob Pearson
378 11th Ave San Francisco, CA 94118-4721

From:	bapresta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Presta
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Thursday, August 21, 2025 7:01:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Barbara Presta
2815 Buchanan St San Francisco, CA 94123-4808

From: dolbay@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Liam Hennessy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 7:05:49 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: As a native San Franciscan and a SFUSD Special Education Teacher I am against this "Up Zoning" for many reasons. One in particular is that there has been no "neighborhood meetings" with elected Supervisors to hear the concerns of the residents about the heights increases that will change our neighborhoods for ever. Affordable housing??? That phrase has been thrown around since the 1990s and no one has ever explained what they mean by "affordable housing". What is affordable for an AI tech is not affordable for the nurse, teacher, waiter etc.
We need created ways of increasing housing NOT DEVELOPERS making HUGE profits and DESTROYING our neighborhoods. HAVE THE RESIDENTS INVOLVED AND NOT TRY TO PUSH THIS PLAN THROUGH...We can all work together if all voices are heard, not just THE BILLIONAIRS.

Sincerely,
Liam Hennessy
169 Pfeiffer St San Francisco, CA 94133-2019

From: jmhurabiell1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judi Hurabiell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 7:17:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Judi Hurabiell
259 14th Ave San Francisco, CA 94118-1007

From: dona@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Crowder
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 7:32:58 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Donna Crowder
16 Crown Ter San Francisco, CA 94114-2106

From: stephjparry@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephanie Parry
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 8:26:03 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Stephanie Parry
1352 47th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-1115

From: patricia_inez@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Thompson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 8:34:56 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Patrice Thompson
443 40th Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-1509

From: kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 8:38:35 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
PO Box 14350 San Francisco, CA 94114-0350

From: blandinafarley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Blandina Farley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 8:49:42 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: I've lived in North Beach since the 1970s… I'm a tour guide all over the city and mostly North Beach.I love this neighborhood and the reason locals and tourists come to North Beach is because of it's architecture, small businesses authenticity, history, Italian food and artistic bohemian atmosphere and because it's a welcoming community… I can't understand who could possibly Believe building high rises would be an advantage for tourism or the economy in small neighborhoods such as this… high rises will only make it less desirable for people to come here besides the fact North Beach has been home to people who have lived here for many years such as myself who have rent control and could not afford to live here if buildings went down and rent went up w... This is not a solution to anything … it's a greed grab that will only benefit people who already have money but want more,,,it will destroy. The spirit of San Francisco which is what has made San Francisco beloved throughout the world even when the United States is not looked upon with favor... It is heartbreaking to think politicians have no conscience or awareness or care about history,,,, politicians are using the arts as a front for their own game... If you need to build there's so many places that could use building and housing not neighborhoods like North Beach and Chinatown etc.that are already overcrowded

Sincerely,
Blandina Farley
1432 Stockton St San Francisco, CA 94133-3815

From: jean.stanley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jean Stanley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 8:53:38 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

There will never be enough low income housing in San Francisco even if 15 story buildings are built…but destruction of the charm of San Francisco's neighborhoods is guaranteed should the state continue down this path. Better that the state become the Golden State once again so that residents can actually make a living without government assistance. I realize that Democrats and trust fund babies have no clue about how to turn the state around, but they can at least try. Thank you for your attention to this matter!

Sincerely,
Jean Stanley
2352 Funston Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-1947

From: rodneyminott@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rodney Minott
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 9:11:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: I live in Potrero Hill and was very active in the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning. We don't need nor want more up- zoning in our neighborhood!

Sincerely,
Rodney Minott
1206 Mariposa St San Francisco, CA 94107-2419

From:	maury.raycroft@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maurice Raycroft
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Thursday, August 21, 2025 9:21:59 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Maurice Raycroft
2177 Greenwich St San Francisco, CA 94123-3404

From: shoshod5623@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of shoshanah dobry
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 9:37:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

This bill seems to create more problems than it solves. We have so many issues about the lack of affordability for housing & this seems to solve none of that at all. That is what we should be focusing on so as to keep our present population and hopefully grow it. that can only be in a city where housing is affordable for people at all income levels & not just those for the higher income population.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
shoshanah dobry
5900 3rd St San Francisco, CA 94124-3145

From:	ftblote@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Francine Lofrano
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Thursday, August 21, 2025 9:40:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement and an activist & developer dream come true but it is a nightmare for actual resident of the established neighborhoods that would be affected!

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: STOP CATERING TO YIMBY ACTIVISTS & DEVELOPERS!!!!!

Sincerely,
Francine Lofrano
29 Westwood Dr San Francisco, CA 94112-1219

From: andreacgalvin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrea Galvin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 10:43:10 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
This bill is insane. It is a corrupt land grab by developers with absolutely no regard for the lives and safety of actual Californians. It fails to take into account that we live in a seismically active state due for a major earthquake in the next 30 years and that most of the state is at severe risk for wildfires. People will die because of this. That our supposed representatives would shirk their duties to their constituents and allow Weiner to bully them into voting for this awful bill is disillusioning. Just say no to SB 79.

Sincerely,
Andrea Galvin
115 Sea Cliff Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-1124

From: mcandrewrocks@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James McAndrew
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 10:51:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
James McAndrew
1327 31st Ave Apt 4 San Francisco, CA 94122-1446

From: irismvbucchioni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Iris Bucchioni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 11:06:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Iris Bucchioni
19 Cerritos Ave San Francisco, CA 94127-2703

From: villaterr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Taber
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 11:07:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Patricia Taber
40 Villa Ter San Francisco, CA 94114-2142

From: susie2500@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susie Gregory
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 11:36:02 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Susie Gregory
2741 Union St San Francisco, CA 94123-3807

From: kline.jb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeffrey Kline
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 11:37:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: I know Assemblymember Matt Haney from when he was D6 Supervisor in San Francisco, and am thankful for all the time, energy, and help he gave to residents and small businesses in our small neighborhood on Treasure Island, especially in regards to issues of displacement and relocation rights. So I'm surprised and disappointed to learn that he supports SB 79.

I hope he might reconsider given the widespread grassroots opposition emerging in SF and across California. I wish he had seen the packed BoS Chamber a few months ago when the Land Use Committee Chair held a preliminary hearing on the Upzoning Plan for SF. After a two hour meeting, at least 80 folks stood in line for several hours to make 2 minute comments. I was near the end of that line and noted that roughly 80% of the comments were against the Upzoning Plan.

The Regional Housing Needs legislation is undemocratic and unduly burdensome, will never produce the affordable housing that we really need. Its just a giveaway to big money developers. Please stand with a vast majority of engaged citizens and vote No on SB 79!

Sincerely,
Jeffrey Kline
1221 Mariner Dr Unit C San Francisco, CA 94130-1212

From: emailamr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ann Rubin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 11:49:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Ann Rubin
1020 Union St Apt 27 San Francisco, CA 94133-5314

From: mpegdietz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Dietz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 11:55:17 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
Instead of planning endless development, why don't you plan for what the optimum maximum population of SF should be given the amount of water available per person in a drought. San Francisco does not need more density to be vibrant; it is vibrant enough already, and is becoming insufferable. There is already too much overcrowding on Muni busses. We don't need more high rises on so-called transportation corridors to make matters worse. If this were REAL planning, you would ask the people what we want. We don't want to be in an earthquake with a bunch of high buildings around.

Sincerely,
Margaret Dietz
1472 Filbert St Apt 601 San Francisco, CA 94109-1631

From: mail@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Josie Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 1:00:15 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

It doesn't establish, let alone address, a minimum percentage of 30 percent BMR housing of its building's tenants. Considering DAHLIA lotteries are already a 1-in-800 or more long shot, this is yet another reason to VOTE NO.

Any building that is 6 stories or more will egregiously impact ingress, egress, parking, and traffic on two-lane streets in established neighborhoods, especially in an era of increased home delivery. Yet another reasson to VOTE NO.

The heights proposed obstruct the views that make our city panoramic. Have no doubt: IT WILL affect tourism. Considering the importance of this income source to our city, vote NO.

Don't turn San Francisco into a highly impacted megopolis like Houston or Atlanta.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Josie Brown
1761 Vallejo St Apt 204 San Francisco, CA 94123-5029

From: sf21roger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roger Weinman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 1:23:17 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: So many vacant second home in North Beach/District 3.

SF doesn't need more condos.

Sincerely,
Roger Weinman
1136 Kearny St Apt 3 San Francisco, CA 94133-4039

From: fenechkristen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kristen Fenech
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 1:56:33 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We have lived in our condo for 23 years - I'm a nurse who has worked hard serving my community in that time - the last 5 years have changed San Francisco enormously - more upheaval will not help current residents stay, and the idea that the extra housing proposed would fill needed gaps doesn't make sense these days - the market does not match the proposition. The housing bill like several other ideas which arose in the last decade (harm reduction, not enforcing crime laws etc) may need to be reinvrestigated with fresh eyes that are living in boots on the ground!

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Kristen Fenech
1200 Gough St Unit 23D San Francisco, CA 94109-6630

From: dcohen27@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Cohen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 4:55:04 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: I'm concerned about increased building heights that will alter the character of the west side of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
David Cohen
865 44th Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-3307

From: shop@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of beth weissman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 5:19:27 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: Everything that makes San Francisco what it is will be destroyed by this disgusting bill.

Sincerely,
beth weissman
2127 Broadway St Apt 6 San Francisco, CA 94115-1310

From: danaamarisa@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dana Amarisa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 6:17:15 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Don’t cave on bills benefitting only big developers. Stand up for residents who want family neighborhoods!!

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Dana Amarisa
2652 Union St San Francisco, CA 94123-3817

From: thanos@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Athanassios Diacakis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 7:07:10 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

You have to get out of this build-build-build insanity. Look at other desirable places that have been built up - they are still just as expensive.

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Athanassios Diacakis
3830 18th St San Francisco, CA 94114-2616

From:	donna.howe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Howe
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Friday, August 22, 2025 7:56:12 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a long time native resident of San Francisco (I am 71 years young), I have seen housing policy changes in many forms.
Pressure from Sacramento is one thing - we know how the influence to bend the knee is strong in the attempt to secure funds; but, as you are our San Francisco representative, I appeal to you to show more leadership and acknowledge that the logic behind both SB 79 and the current Family Housing Zoning Plan is faulty and will not yield the affordable housing goals that it purports to.

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Donna Howe
85 Entrada Ct San Francisco, CA 94127-2814

From: dmshea@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Debbie Fox
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 8:04:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Debbie Fox
366 Marietta Dr San Francisco, CA 94127-1846

From: calistamaroevich@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Calista Maroevich
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 8:08:17 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Calista Maroevich
1522 42nd Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-3042

From: johngarrity@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Garrity
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 8:11:54 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
John Garrity
10 Cedro Ave San Francisco, CA 94127-2702

From: Ckar101@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kim Russo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 8:28:18 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Kim Russo
3339 Noriega St San Francisco, CA 94122-4049

From: sfdidi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Anderson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 8:33:24 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Diana Anderson
MASONIC Ave San Francisco, CA 94117

From: lisa.arjes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Arjes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 8:50:52 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
Housing decisions should happen at the local level with community input. They should not be state-mandated policies meant to gentrify and displace existing residents and small businesses.

Please vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Lisa Arjes
1375 35th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-1328

From: elizabethmccarty@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elizabeth McCarty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 8:51:03 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: Please reconsider building high rise buildings in our beloved neighborhoods. Reshaping our neighborhood will impact small businesses and make it less affordable. 14 story buildings starting on Laguna Street and Lombard Street will block resident's views and the character of the North end of our city.

Kind regards,
- Elizabeth McCarty

Sincerely,
Elizabeth McCarty
1960 Vallejo St Apt 1 San Francisco, CA 94123-4944

From: pugaykm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Pugay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 8:54:50 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Pugay
26 Shore View Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-1629

From: mdonnici@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Donnici
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 9:11:27 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
Pls don't ruin our City further, we have enough of a dense population

Sincerely,
Mary Donnici
115 San Fernando Way San Francisco, CA 94127-1944

From: julie@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Giles
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 9:13:40 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
San Francisco should not be mandated by the state to make sweeping developments that will forever change our character and charm. These developments will encourage the demolition of older structures and displace small business that make our city unique. The city should be given the ability to address housing in a way that works for this area.

Sincerely,
Julie Giles
425 2nd Ave Apt 2 San Francisco, CA 94118-3255

From: patskain@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrick Skain
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 9:23:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Without massive infrastructure improvements and protections for the environment, this bill is dangerous to our future. Given the population growth that California has experienced over the past 50 years, we need to stop. San Francisco has become an island. We have isolated ourselves and when the next earthquake occurs no one is coming to save us.

Sincerely,
Patrick Skain
300 Crestlake Dr San Francisco, CA 94132-1321

From: khoppersf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kimberly Hopper
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 9:23:53 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Kimberly Hopper
1070 Post St San Francisco, CA 94109-5676

From: phil.lumsden999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip Lumsden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 9:50:04 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Philip Lumsden
553 A Greenwich St San Francisco, CA 94133-7128

From: jacamp313@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jerome Camp
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 10:10:09 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Jerome Camp
1216 Woodview Ter Los Altos, CA 94024-7046

From: AUDREYCRLS@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of AUDREY CARLSON
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 10:38:20 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is another bill with unknown pitfalls.

Senator Weiner crafts his bills without constituents' input and continues to layer on higher and higher mandatory height limits--his words are not to be trusted. While Senator Weiner has sounded perfectly reasonable during public gatherings in San Francisco, he and his office fail to provide details of his proposals. (A specific example: at a neighborhood meeting at the old CPMC hospital while now Assembly member Stefani was Supervisor, Mr. Weiner asked us to look out the window and take a look at the 4 story residences around us. He assured us that this is what he meant by upsizing. He told us that he would provide this in writing. Despite contacting Stefani and Weiner's offices, this information was never provided.)

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
AUDREY CARLSON
2364 A Vallejo St San Francisco, CA 94123-4712

From: catvse@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of T Tietz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 10:41:39 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:third Street rail was built to help develop the 3rd st area but nothing else has been done since. It's people need this kind of stuff to vitalize their neighborhood, other neighborhoods do not, and not concentrating on that area could be considered Racist, in a democratic city?outrageous!

Shoving out-of-scale towers into many of the other neighborhoods will only serve to destroy the individual character of each community, none of you would do this to your own neighborhood.

Screw Newsome, don't let him hold us hostage for funds. He's history anyway and you don't need him anymore

Sincerely,
T Tietz
657 San Francisco, CA 93131

From: john.decock@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John DeCock
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 10:45:36 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Scott Weiner's desire to force inappropriately sited buildings into San Francisco Neighborhoods is going to kill our city if we don't stop it. And it's completely unnecessary.. It's a lazy solution to an overstated problem that assumes logarithmic growth in San Francisco that the facts just don't support. Overbuilding on spec is a developer's dream, but it is not worth killing the neighborhoods that make San Francisco such a great city.

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Let's move forward on addressing housing needs in thoughtful way that applies some real critical thinking and analysis to the problem rather than forcing such a blunt instrument on our city. Take some time to find a better approach instead of acting out of panic.

Sincerely,
John DeCock
3789 Market St San Francisco, CA 94131-1340

From: pat.gray8@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Gray
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 10:56:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Patricia Gray
208 N Lake Merced Hls Apt 2A San Francisco, CA 94132-2920

From: glowglow9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gloria Maciejewski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 11:14:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

I am NOT a "nativist" as certain "YIMBY" groups may suggest. Nor am I a maligned "NIMBY", who doesn't want housing built. I am a renter, I am a mother, I make a middle class salary and I want to see actual safe and AFFORDABLE homes for other working class people.

PLEASE Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Begging you!!!

Sincerely,
Gloria Maciejewski
3277 20th St San Francisco, CA 94110-2726

From: barbarajheffernan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Heffernan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 11:52:43 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Vote NO on SB79. Listen to your constituents who voted for you. Don’t cave to Weiner’s tactics.
SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Barbara Heffernan
2423 Green St San Francisco, CA 94123-4626

From: nhf009@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of N. Fee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 12:01:14 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents, the residents of San Francisco. Do right by tourists who visit because they love our city's distinctive culture, architectural character and scale and spectacular views. Vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
N. Fee
1105 Greenwich St San Francisco, CA 94109-1506

From: jillfenton@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jill Fenton
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 12:27:56 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Jill Fenton
23 Napier Ln San Francisco, CA 94133-3213

From: tvobsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anthony Villa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 12:29:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: We are losing our children and families by turning family homes into high rise condos. This would turn our family neighborhoods into downtown.

Sincerely,
Anthony Villa
4447 Kirkham St San Francisco, CA 94122-2807

From: barry@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barry Hermanson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 1:06:43 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

I support building more housing, but it shouldn't primarily be market rate.

Sincerely,
Barry Hermanson
2467 28th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-2306

From: powkatz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Powell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 1:29:27 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Judith Powell
2 Whiting St San Francisco, CA 94133-2454

From: kori.kody@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kori Kody
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 1:37:49 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

We don't want developers given a free hand with no citizen control. This is a very important issue. Vote NO!

Sincerely,
Kori Kody
2876 Shasta Rd Berkeley, CA 94708-2047

From: sarahssung@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sarah Sung
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 2:52:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Sarah Sung
2958 Scott St San Francisco, CA 94123-3829

From: hjdobbins@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Heather Dobbins
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 3:04:34 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Heather Dobbins
515 42nd Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-2530

From: bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 4:08:48 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Robert Hall
1946 Grove St Apt 6 San Francisco, CA 94117-1149

From: Hilarie_connolly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of hilarie connolly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 4:38:52 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

I live on Mt Davison and we have seen several houses demolished due to the degradation of the soil comprising the hills due water damage. The damage caused by streams in the hills and a damaged reservoir. Before allowing large buildings on the westside of town, it is very important to determine just what type of building the area will sustain with the current resources.

Sincerely,
hilarie connolly
111 Robinhood Dr San Francisco, CA 94127-1626

From: gbsundby@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of George Sundby
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 4:41:52 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: As a 50 year resident in San Francisco, having lived in many neighborhoods, the charm of San Francisco is its unique areas. Don't destroy what makes San Francisco by randomly changing the zoning to allow 6, 8 and 10 story buildings in local neighborhoods. Planned growth in Park Merced and Stonestown should be the focus of expansion. Don't destroy what makes San Francisco unique!!!!

Sincerely,
George Sundby
90 Cedro Ave San Francisco, CA 94127-2702

From: jknjl127@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jill Bittner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 4:50:59 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
I am outraged at the broad sweeps of height increases you have proposed all over San Francisco. Your short-sighted proposed height limit increases have massive ramifications for our City. Our height limits are essential to the character and charm of San Francisco.

But I want to specifically address my neighborhood of Aquatic Park and Fisherman's Wharf and how doubling the height limits for those areas to 65 feet would be devastating to those iconic hill-swept neighborhoods and the priceless beauty of our waterfront.

The iconic hills of our waterfront rise dramatically from the Bay waters and seemingly all the way to the clouds. They are what songs, poems and movies are written about.

From the water, views of those neighborhoods have been photographed a million times over. Hundreds of thousands of tourists marvel at them from cruise ships every year. Videos of them compliment nearly every sports broadcast. I am disgusted to think, so many decades ago, views of our majestic hills were nearly completely obliterated by sky rises like the horrendous Fontana buildings.

From land, sweeping views of the Bay would be horribly obstructed or completely blocked by doubling the height limits in those neighborhoods. Views of the Golden Gate Bridge from the cable car on Hyde Street would no longer take visitors' breath away because buildings would stand in the way. And the long fight to establish Francisco Park will have all been for naught because its very best asset, views of the Bay, would no longer exist.

The height limits established in our neighborhoods have made San Francisco arguably one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Please do not let your short-sighted attempt to meet the State's ill-conceived and unattainable mandate for more housing destroy the very thing that makes San Francisco iconic. Please reconsider your appalling massive height limit increases. SF's beauty is NOT FOR SALE!

Sincerely,
Jill Bittner
828 Bay St San Francisco, CA 94109-1247

From:	eliseravel3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elise Ravel
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Friday, August 22, 2025 5:25:19 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Elise Ravel
37 Wilder St San Francisco, CA 94131-3007

From: eanddshiraki@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emi Miyoshi-Shiraki
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 5:32:02 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

As a life-long resident of San Francisco and a 47-year resident of the Sunset District, it distresses me to see how regulations are destroying neighborhoods in San Francisco. I realize that a city that is 7miles x 7 miles can only build up, but allowing buildings without some thought to reasonable height restrictions will destroy the character of San Francisco, strain the already overloaded water and sewage resources, and add to parking problems in areas with little or no street parking; losing 8-parking spaces at every intersection has further exacerbated the parking problem. As it is, I already do all of my shopping and dining-out in San Mateo County where I don't have to worry about finding parking. This city already disregards senior citizens and people with limited mobility. How many times have we driven to a restaurant only to find that we cannot find a place to park. This proposal is just one more thing to make living in San Francisco even more difficult.

Sincerely,
Emi Miyoshi-Shiraki
1751 31st Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-4203

From: epml@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Larsen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 5:48:03 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Michael Larsen
1029 Jones St San Francisco, CA 94109-5023

From:	yelsoma@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Mosley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Friday, August 22, 2025 7:20:38 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is no housing solution — it's a market-driven green light to developers.

A blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and stipulates no real affordability requirements.

It also flagrantly disregards the communities who will be impacted by this legislation. What ever happened to local democracy?

Please represent your constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Alice Mosley
1122 Stanyan St # A San Francisco, CA 94117-3813

From: sf.lorna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lorna Walker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 7:21:11 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: Please stand up to the Yes I'm a Bully (YIMBY) and their developer donors. They are trying to give away California. Trickle down housing doesn't work and it's proven. Just look at Toronto! Save our City from excessive development and corporate giveaways.

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker
2351 Bush St San Francisco, CA 94115-3123

From: lacarnes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lance Carnes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 7:21:41 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It will forever change for the worse my neighborhood, Telegraph Hill, in District 3.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Lance Carnes
722 Lombard St Apt 201 San Francisco, CA 94133-2371

From: designangles@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lily Chow
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 7:41:21 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement and windfall for developers.

It has been stated for quite some time that California needs more housing on the premise of the increasing unhoused population. That includes San Francisco, however interviews with unhoused people state their reason to live on the streets is affordability, that is lack of enough income to afford the market rate rental units. Although the SF Planning Commission spent a year or more to develop a plan to meet the 82,000 new housing units requirement by some year, it was developed without input from property owners and the community. The SF Planning Commission's (SFPC) map of upzoned buildings devalue existing properties (e.g., loss of views, access, income and more).

In addition, obtaining and retaining fire and liability insurance is the latest obstacle in California. Insurance companies are reluctant to insure high density buildings and/or the density of already insured property customers in specific areas, which makes obtaining insurance much more difficult, especially landlord protections policies.

The SFPC's plan is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers and billionaire investors that fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements. Moreover, their plan does not include provisions for the infrastructure, schools, emergency services, or public transit upgrades required to support such dramatic density increases. It also fails to address sustainability, tree canopy, or the carbon cost of demolition and new construction.

On the other hand, the financial district has many empty buildings. Although some companies are mandating their employees return to the office, generally that is for a few days a week such that they no longer need the large spaces they leased prior to the Covid 19 pandemic. San Francisco ought to seriously consider converting those buildings since there already is existing infrastructure of plumbing, electricity, and even parking garages for some buildings. Since former Mayor Breed proposed the idea, a lot of architects, engineers, and developers have assessed and developed conversions as viable. Rather than loose property tax dollars when vacant buildings currently sell for less than 50% of the previous purchase value prices, conversions are potentially added-property value buildings; thus, increasing the City's tax base.

Please stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Lily Chow
875 California St Unit 602 San Francisco, CA 94108-2342

From: sanjose940@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cheryl Richard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 8:17:21 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Cheryl Richard
940 San Jose Ave Apt 4 San Francisco, CA 94110-5450

From: camiegal22@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cameron Galloway
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 11:29:59 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

The representatives who stand with their constituents against SB79 make those who support SB79 look very bad. It's time to do the right thing. It's time to be public servants not career politicians. It's time to serve the best interests of the public not profit.

Sincerely,
Cameron Galloway
351 Cornwall St Apt 6 San Francisco, CA 94118-1354

From:	jknjl127@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jill B.
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Friday, August 22, 2025 11:34:45 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: This is a shameful land grab and developer give-away. I don't know how any of you responsible for this abhorrent farce of a bill can live with yourselves.

Sincerely,
Jill B.
844 Bay St San Francisco, CA 94109-1233

From: nmartin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nancy Martin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 11:42:49 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Why should you vote NO on SB 79? Because Senator Weiner and his buddies have already ruined our cities and this beautiful state. SB79.is just the final nail in the coffin. Please spare us any more of this mass houimg. SF is beginning tp look like Hong Kong and we have lost our charm. Tourists no linger want to visit.
Gov Newsom's mandated regional housing numbers have already overloaded our streets and schools. It's a disaster! All people can talk about is how Senator Weiner snd his state legislators screwed us over, People are angry and hate what you've done and continue to do.
We now have hundreds of have ugly, square, tacky box developments all over the city because Newsom and Wiener took away the city's ability to dictate our local standards and the developers knew that so they took the cheapest way out. Theres no longer a sense of priide to their work. It's about making fast money and providing more property taxes for the state. Now we have to live with these monstrosities! Why would you think the residents of CA would want this? Senator Weiner is the worst thing to ever happen to CA. I was born and raised here, he clearly wasn't because if he, or any of you, loved CA the way we do, you couldn't destroy it like this.
And just when we thought it couldnt get any worse, you add this!! We dont need more housing, especially high density housing. Our streets, schools, sewer system and water supply are already over burdened.

SB79 to is not a housing solution, its a horrible idea and if you vote yes on it, then YOU are part of the problem. Do the right thing, stop bending over to this tyrant, Senator Weiner and vote No! Your political career depends on it and people will respect you for your common sense and decency.

NO ONE WANTS SB79 To pass, so please say NO and acknowledge that you heard us.
We will be singing your praises when you do!

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.
Thank you!

Sincerely,
Nancy Martin
1600 Holloway Ave San Francisco, CA 94132-1722

From: jmchew@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Chew
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 11:48:58 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

I lived in the Civic Center area for 22 years and escaped the development just in the nick of time. Yes, some of the development was beneficial but overall it created more bipolar split between the old and the new, the tenderloin and parts surrounding.

Now I live in the Inner Sunset and dread the idea of heavy handed blunt instrument such as SB79. We may need more housing. Exactly how is that manifesting with more remote work? Can't some of the offices be converted. What make our City a fantastic place to live is the open spaces, horizontal as well as vertical. We do not need congested skylines and the ruination of well-balanced neighborhoods.

There has got to be a better way than rampant development which so often means the literal bulldozing of people's opinions/needs by the few developers. We do not want the crazymaking of building without a wise and thoughtful plan. Not all growth is good growth.

Sincerely,
Judy Chew
1495 7th Ave Apt 1 San Francisco, CA 94122-3732

From: lucyhilmer@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lucy Hilmer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 1:00:23 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Catherine Stefani, Matt Haney, and Senator Weiner,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Don't sell the soul of the city I love to the highest bidder.

Sincerely,
Lucy Hilmer
692 17th Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-3860

From: lucyhilmer@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lucy Hilmer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 1:00:24 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Don't sell the soul of the city I love to the highest bidder!

Sincerely,
Lucy Hilmer
692 17th Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-3860

From:	hlfprsn79@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jose Ricardo Rivero
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Saturday, August 23, 2025 3:36:20 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
San Francisco is not like any other city in the country. It needs solutions specific to its needs.

Sincerely,
Jose Ricardo Rivero
351 Cornwall St San Francisco, CA 94118-1375

From: jkj2000@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Larry Quantz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 7:56:58 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Folks, this is ridiculous. SB 79 is an upzoner's dream-- to the detriment (for example) of the 850k people who live in San Francisco currently.

If you listen the the Abundance network, San Francisco should have 2 million people in it. That's nuts, but they have the ear of Scott Wiener and the YIMBY faction, as evidenced by this bill.

Don't believe me? Listen to Abundance guru Ezra Klein, who thinks San Jose could look like Shenzen, with skyscrapers everywhere. See the 5 min mark below:

https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://x.com/steady_drumbeat/status/1923073500941590639___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzowZWU2Y2Y0MmRmMzhhY2YzZmRhYWQyOTY1ZDlhYWVmMTo3OjIzNGY6MjU1NzUyZDc4N2UwNWM2YTY0NDcyMzJmMzM0ZGI1MzFhNTlmMDY1MmMyZjJhM2ZjMGE0YzA4Mjk1Yjg1NmY1NDpwOlQ6Tg

According to Klein, San Jose is full of strip malls and single family homes and ripe for a full redo. Shame about the million people who live there now but you have to break some eggs to make an omelette I suppose.

Do any of you think your existing constituents are going to put up with a blanket of 7-15 story condo complexes popping up? Look no further than poor Joel Engardio to see what electoral fate awaits anyone who signs off on something like this.

Please tell Senator Wiener and those pushing SB 79 behind the scenes to lie down for a bit, while you vote this down. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Larry Quantz
2326 38th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-2141

From: jag.august@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joyce August
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 8:18:15 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Joyce August
2430 25th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-2340

From: NAPLISA123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ann NAPOLI
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 8:28:54 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Please.

This will cause sudden and permanent change to San Francisco. Can we not knit together a compromise that is more nuanced and figure out real strategy for affordable housing? What about the small businesses which will be displaced? Please say no to this blanket approach.

Sincerely,
Ann NAPOLI
110 Junipero Serra Blvd San Francisco, CA 94127-1955

From: kaufmannnancy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nancy Kaufmann
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 9:03:02 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement. LA had the strength to stand against this. I expect that of you as well. I have already seen this in my neighborhood. It is not resulted in affordable housing. This will not result in affordable housing. It will not help the working people of San Francisco.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Nancy Kaufmann
1058 Florida St San Francisco, CA 94110-3437

From: kamdinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kameela Din
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 9:32:07 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

I've lived in San Francisco my entire life, in Ingleside and the inner Richmond, and I'm sick of seeing only luxury condos being built! Where is the affordable housing? Where are our teachers, service workers and public servants going to live? A city can't run without them!

Further, building high-rise towers on fill and sand in earthquake -prone areas is not only stupid but reckless. People will die if these buildings liquefy! I remember the devastation of 1989 and I don't want to see lives lost unnecessarily in the next one due to rushed and thoughtless planning. We deserve better!

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Kameela Din
351 Cornwall St San Francisco, CA 94118-1375

From: cydney1010@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cydney DeBenedetto
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 9:38:55 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Cydney DeBenedetto
215 Avery Ln Los Gatos, CA 95032-7335

From: padysplace@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Luis Pine
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 9:40:07 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

As residents of San Francisco, we can give good input and feedback to the questions on how San Francisco can grow without loosing the beauty that attracts so many to visit, specially in the low rise west and north crescent. Let's not let the business ambitions of an industry (building) together with the political ambitions of professional politicians dictate designs that only serve them.

Sincerely,
Luis Pine
1322 47th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-1115

From: richardivanhoe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Ivanhoe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 9:43:01 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

Transit-oriented development makes no sense when we are losing public transit much faster than we can build housing. We need to fill vacant units and build already entitled housing before we provide incentives for demolition.

We also need to add severe penalties for wrongful demolition.

SB 79 is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Richard Ivanhoe
516 Clayton St San Francisco, CA 94117-2907

From: witkasf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan WITKA
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 9:44:25 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Susan WITKA
824 43rd Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-3304

From: elemjw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lin Joe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 9:51:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

I have resided in San Francisco's Sunset district for over 40 years. This plan to upzone our neighborhood is wrong, wrong, wrong!

8 to double digit stories of new development is totally out of character for our district and community.

Please heed the concerns of the residents and citizens of our beloved City.

Sincerely,
Lin Joe
1414 24th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-3312

From: jkmjrsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James Mooney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 9:55:14 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
James Mooney
2536 Broadway St San Francisco, CA 94115-1114

From: jrkyileo2810@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joyce Richardson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 10:03:15 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Joyce Richardson
2950 19th Ave San Francisco, CA 94132-1604

From: toodlehead5@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane Alexander
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 10:08:18 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Jane Alexander
1635 7th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-3716

From: georgesery@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of George Sery
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 10:16:58 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: My wife and I have lived in San Francisco since 1978. We love the incredible diverse and historic character of the neighborhoods where we live. SB79 threatens what makes San Francisco unique...and without a guaranteed reduction in actual costs for housing for those in need! It will guarantee over crowding the city, overloading infrastructure and transit. Developers are the winner. Not the workers and existing residents of the city. Los Angeles leadership has voted against this bill. Please protect our city and it's residents. Vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
George Sery
2414 Gough St San Francisco, CA 94123-5011

From: amy7w2m@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Meyer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 10:20:55 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: I live in a 100-year old + development in the Richmond District, Lincoln Manor. It is a cohesive community, where several residences are multi-generational. I see what is proposed for this area as destructive of the qualities and values of a family-oriented residential area between Clement Street and Geary and between 36th and 38th Avenue.

Sincerely,
Amy Meyer
3627 Clement St San Francisco, CA 94121-1601

From:	jschech@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joel Schechter
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Saturday, August 23, 2025 10:30:04 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

We need more affordable housing, less market rate expensive housing.

Thank you

Sincerely,
Joel Schechter
3657 Wawona St San Francisco, CA 94116-2632

From: vernshah@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Verna Shaheen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 10:40:17 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
Can we please take an inventory of vacant properties in San Francisco? I know of many, including hotels, multi-unit dwellings, etc. It's ridiculous that we are considering building, demolishing, and potentially changing the landscape of our city while substantial already available housing remains vacant. It doesn't pass the smell test and is simply illogical.

Sincerely,
Verna Shaheen
1600 Vallejo St San Francisco, CA 94123-5156

From: sheila.ganz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sheila Ganz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 10:41:20 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Sheila Ganz
1546 Great Hwy San Francisco, CA 94122-2846

From:	caroldb2001@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol DiBenedetto
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79! The devil is in the details. We need 40% mandates for affordability, NOT developer giveaways.
Date:	Saturday, August 23, 2025 10:46:27 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Carol DiBenedetto
154 Corbett Ave San Francisco, CA 94114-1815

From: ceomomsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Crystal Banks
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 10:54:45 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79. You need to get real affordable housing that fits that person's income. Your city is dying and going broke so get real.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Crystal Banks
312 11th Ave Apt B San Francisco, CA 94118-2107

From: cyssf2003@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christina Shih
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 11:10:54 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live two houses down from Geary Blvd and the Mayor's proposed plane ALREADY puts a possible 8 story building RIGHT NEXT to my house which is in the historic Lincoln Manor residential park with beautiful homes developed in 1904-1926, destroying the neighbor character and beauty.

Now SB 79 puts 7 story buildings ALL ALONG GEARY BLVD. This in spite of the budget cutbacks to Muni with the elimination of bus service, longer waits, fewer stops.

People with families and children do not want to live in high rise studio,1-2 bedroom apartments. SF is known for its unique neighborhoods with their distinct character. DO NOT DESTROY what makes San Francisco San Francisco.

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Christina Shih
478 37th Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-1614

From: johnoliver1886@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Koelsch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 11:22:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
John Koelsch
197 Corbett Ave San Francisco, CA 94114-1870

From: peter.yedidia@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Yedidia
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 11:31:20 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Decision Maker,

As we've seen over decades in San Francisco and elsewhere, building more market rate housing DOES NOT make our city more affordable. Displacement of working and middle class people will continue.

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements. Moreover, it will destroy the fabric of beloved San Francisco neighborhoods like North Beach and the Marina.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Peter Yedidia
2020 Stockton St San Francisco, CA 94133-2005

From: conryw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Conor Ryan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 11:40:37 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Conor Ryan
1600 Fell St Apt 206 San Francisco, CA 94117-2045

From: sfwendy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wendy Portnuff
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 11:43:52 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Wendy Portnuff
145 Cerritos Ave San Francisco, CA 94127-2844

From: cbonavico@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christopher Bonavico
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 11:49:57 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Christopher Bonavico
3041 Divisadero St San Francisco, CA 94123-3228

From: beckyfchristian@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Becky Christian
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 11:54:27 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Ms. Stefani,

I voted for you several times and you live in the neighbborhood.

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
ruin our enchanting city
create additional expense that we can not afford
There are more shovel ready approved areas in SF that can already be built.
They won't build affordable housing in these locations, it will be fancy condos.
Buildings of this height should be built in areas that have existing height such as SOMA, South Van Ness

Sincerely,
Becky Christian
2550 Lyon St San Francisco, CA 94123-4663

From: amimolinelli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Molinelli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 11:56:17 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: please don't manipulate educators like myself into believing this is for the common good or equity and access to housing. It's not. We deserve better than to be used as a talking point in a meaningless scam that offers more housing which is. A mask for developer interests. Groups like YIMBY are paid by these people. Offer a solution with interests that actually are from your constituents.

Sincerely,
Amy Molinelli
353 10th Ave San Francisco, CA 94118-2214

From: sfamc2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Arnold Cohn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 12:03:37 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

79 will destroy Cow Hollow and the Marina by converting the neighborhood to a small Manhatten. VOTE NO on &(!

Sincerely,
Arnold Cohn
1550 Bay St San Francisco, CA 94123-1763

From: jennie.parrilla94064@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jennie Parrilla
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 12:14:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Jennie Parrilla
1530 Post St Apt 2A San Francisco, CA 94109-6538

From: elizabethmccarty@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elizabeth McCarty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 12:37:38 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: Strongly appose SB79! The high rise buildings will block our neighborhood's beautiful views and small businesses that are already struggling will become obsolete.

Please find other options that don't affect the landscape and uniqueness of San Francisco.

Kind regards,
- Elizabeth McCarty

Sincerely,
Elizabeth McCarty
1960 Vallejo St Apt 1 San Francisco, CA 94123-4944

From: jennbequio@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jennifer Bequio
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 12:42:59 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Bequio
1808 Sweetwood Dr Daly City, CA 94015-2013

From: lehr.david@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dave Lehr
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 12:52:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement that is unlikely to address San Francisco housing needs outside of those for the wealthy!

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

This is a pivotal moment in determining our future. I am counting on you.

Sincerely,
Dave Lehr
1380 Francisco St San Francisco, CA 94123-2306

From: PCK@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrick Kennedy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote YES on SB 79
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 1:12:28 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I’m a developer active in Berkeley Oakland in San Francisco and S.B. 79 would be immensely valuable in producing more housing for all those communities.

Sincerely,
Patrick Kennedy
2848 Steiner St San Francisco, CA 94123-4716

From: zrants@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mari Eliza
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 1:25:42 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and cities an communities in California like Los Angeles and vote NO on SB 79.
We have so far seen no Lowe housing costs since the build, build, build campaign started over a decade ago.
The Trickle Theory is not working. Stop the destruction of our cities. Return the power to the people.

Sincerely,
Mari Eliza
499 Alabama St San Francisco, CA 94110-1380

From: Wagnerchris@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Chris Wagner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 1:39:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Chris Wagner
2630 Greenwich St San Francisco, CA 94123-3206

From: tab@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Teresa Butler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 1:43:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: San Francisco needs its lower density, human-scale height buildings and residences for the working and middle class instead of shoving heights over four-stories down everyone's throats. The city needs a variety of housing and needs to maintain neighborhood character so that we're not all packed into mid-rise and high-rise places, many of which look the same everywhere you go in the world – – which is fine for folks who want to live in those but not for those who need to live and work in buildings and residences that have more human-scale heights with character.

I guarantee you that I will not vote for anyone who votes for SB 79, which is nothing more than the Democratic version of Trump's edicts. Mayor Lurie, Assembly persons, and supervisors all, develop some spine and backbone and listen to the neighborhood voices that are not in the deep pocket hold of the developers and the DIMBY'S (that is, YIMBY = Develope In My Backyard).

I will never vote for Scott Weiner or Gavin Newsom again – – ever. I feel betrayed.

Sincerely,
Teresa Butler
1322 47th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-1115

From: parack@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Arack
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 1:45:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

SB 79 gifts power to wealthy investors and ignores the taxpayers who don't want luxury highriseswith no parking on site for tenants. These monstrosities will sit empty like The Waverly on Sloat at 48th Ave in SF. For 10 years it has sat mostly empty. No one wants to live in that ugly building.
This is a power grab and money grab by Weiner. Do not vote for this.

Sincerely,
Patricia Arack
1900 Great Hwy San Francisco, CA 94116-1053

From: lwb6@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carolyn Butler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 2:00:45 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Our wonderful city with its fabulously diverse neighborhoods should not be sold to the highest bidders. This looks like the lazy solution to address housing issues throughout the city. Instead, feasible, and productive solutions should be developed neighborhood by neighborhood.The last thing we need are more excessively tall, mostly empty buildings that may never be occupied and/or are unaffordable to most. Those don't build communities, just tax write-offs. As residents, we deserve better than that.

Sincerely,
Carolyn Butler
324 Chestnut St San Francisco, CA 94133-2421

From: jemint@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joan Anton
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 2:14:23 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Joan Anton
1214 Fulton St San Francisco, CA 94117-1508

From: morrison.donna@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Morrison
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on the so-called "Family" up-zoning plan
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 2:23:12 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

THIS BROAD BRUSH "PLAN" TO UP-ZONE WHOLE NEIGHBORHOODS IS NOT A SOLUTION FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

IT IS A LICENSE FOR DEVELOPERS AND LAND SPECULATORS THROUGH THEIR WELL PAID LOBBYISTS TO DAMAGE WHAT MANY OF US HAVE WORKED DECADES TO PROTECT.

I'VE OWNED AND LIVED IN MY SAN FRANCISCO VICTORIAN FOR 50 YEARS...AND WORKED HARD TO RESTORE IT AND THE STREET I LIVE ON. I'M GROSSLY OFFENDED TO BE LABELED A "NIMBY" BY THOSE WHOSE INTERESTS ARE PURELY FINANCIAL AND/OR POLITICAL...WHO HAVE THE AUDACITY TO SLAP "FAMILY" ON THIS DEAL THAT WILL ULTIMATELY MAKE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD NEITHER ATTRACTIVE NOR AFFORDABLE TO FAMILIES.

SHAME ON YOU.

Sincerely,
Donna Morrison
2523 Gough St San Francisco, CA 94123-5012

From: judydoanesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Doane
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 2:26:56 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Judith Doane
3101 California St San Francisco, CA 94115-2409

From:	ewallenber@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ellis Wallenberg
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79! Keep S.F. neighborhoods unique for residents and tourists who come here to experience and spend money!
Date:	Saturday, August 23, 2025 2:32:58 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Ellis Wallenberg
178 25th Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-1107

From: neil.meerani@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Neeraj Meerani
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 3:26:35 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Neeraj Meerani
2825 Van Ness Ave San Francisco, CA 94109-1437

From: battard@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Attard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 3:45:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

We need more housing but we must create affordable housing for our homeless and low income residents. We also must preserve our neighborhoods and not cave to develope overreach.

Sincerely,
Barbara Attard
340 Peralta Ave San Francisco, CA 94110-5336

From: peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 3:50:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Peter Lee
3910 Fulton St San Francisco, CA 94118-3556

From:	jack.levin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jack Levin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79! This bill will allow high density housing which will make it impossible to find parking spaces (already very limited) in the Outer Richmond district.
Date:	Saturday, August 23, 2025 4:01:59 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Jack Levin
87 Shore View Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-1631

From:	kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Saturday, August 23, 2025 4:30:23 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
PO Box 14350 San Francisco, CA 94114-0350

From: list_bossy.2r@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol Fenwick
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 5:05:04 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
None of the new developments that I've seen in the Bay Area meet the need for housing in this area. The prices are too high for the average resident. Children who grew up here must leave the area to afford housing.

An example is the development on the corner of Winchester and 280 North in San Jose. Not only is it a horrible eyesore but it removed an affordable housing area (RV park) for the residents. Do you think any of those folks could afford to live in this huge development?
The result of this overdevelopment is supplying housing to wealthy citizens of other countries and lining the pockets of real estate developers and agents.

Sincerely,
Carol Fenwick
1317 Ensenada Way Los Altos, CA 94024-6122

From: davidheran@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Heran
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 5:18:31 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: What part of local zoning does Sacramento NOT understand? SB79 eliminates any concern for our zoning laws.The Fontana apartments next to Galileo High school on North Point street was a wake-up call years ago, in the 1960's, to NOT

construct buildings that are not in keeping with neighborhood characteristics in San Francisco. Will we NEVER learn from past mistakes? The wind tunnels on the 1000 block of North Point street can reach 60mph on a blustery day. Inside out umbrellas are the theme on rainy

days.

Stop constructing Communist China-style high rise residences in California, in keeping with the Governors's World Economic Forum agenda that proposes 15 minute cities worldwide, where the populace will own nothing, and be happy. The voters will only be happy

when SB79, and any other similar legislation, is summarily defeated, and local planning determines building practices.

Sincerely,
David Heran
1763 Filbert St San Francisco, CA 94123-3649

From:	tmvonflandrich@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Theresa Flandrich
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79! Remove demos of existing housing
Date:	Saturday, August 23, 2025 5:57:29 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: We have been through waves of speculation which displaced thousands of our neighbors . Do not participate in a plan that demolishes existing housing & incentivizes building luxury condos. Do support & incentivize truly affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Theresa Flandrich
515 Lombard St San Francisco, CA 94133-2313

From: parkladydi1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diane Palacio
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 6:31:23 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Diane Palacio
44 Ellington Ave San Francisco, CA 94112-3621

From: glish.lauren@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lauren Glish
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 7:38:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
I love the Marina and Cow Hollow neighborhoods in SF, and many others, for their non-city village-like feel. This upzoning bill would destroy what gives SF so much of its charm and soul. To destroy this to add more high-density housing without clear affordability or earthquake safety requirements is completely irresponsible.

Why not re-zone existing high-rise office buildings, to allow conversion to residential housing?

Sincerely,
Lauren Glish
175 Alhambra St San Francisco, CA 94123-2033

From: justintruong56@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2025 11:48:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Justin Truong
33 Junior Ter San Francisco, CA 94112-3245

From:	mauramana@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maura Mana
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Sunday, August 24, 2025 7:39:07 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Maura Mana
137 Warren Dr San Francisco, CA 94131-1030

From: pat.huey@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Huey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2025 8:03:08 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

At the very least, if you must build these godawful eyesores, please do the following:

1) Mandate that each unit have a parking space. You need to face the fact that most San Franciscans own cars. Making it impossible to park is not a solution.
2) Mandate that the new eyesores you have planned will not be built on top of toxic landfill, like the one at Irving and 26th is.
3) Mandate that historical buildings such as Victorians -- FOR WHICH SAN FRANCISCO IS FAMOUS! -- are not destroyed.
4) Mandate that they fit in with the architecture of the surrounding neighborhood. The one you put up at Stanyan and Haight, a Victorian neighborhood, looks like Soviet architecture.

Sincerely,
Patricia Huey
1443 B Page St San Francisco, CA 94117-2066

From: janscatt13@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janice Scattini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2025 8:43:50 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: Please don't ruin historical neighborhoods when there are so many undeveloped areas of San Francisco that can be built up with proper infrastructure. Allowing tall buildings in the Marina and Cow Hollow for instance will not provide lower income housing, just more high end view properties for the wealthy while ruining the views of existing homes. Not to mention the current infrastructure in some of these neighborhoods would be severely compromised by such an increase of population. Creating new neighborhoods like the Dog Patch, Central Waterfront and beyond have endless possibilities. Finally, the population has decreased in San Francisco and the numbers required to provide more housing by the state need to be revisited based on current statistics, not from many years ago.
Please do what you can to save our neighborhoods!

Sincerely,
Janice Scattini
2060 Union St Ph 7 San Francisco, CA 94123-4101

From: cyerge@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of colleen yerge
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2025 9:23:40 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
colleen yerge
83 Water St San Francisco, CA 94133-1838

From: thebirichino@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Small
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2025 6:15:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Mark Small
84 Palm Ave San Francisco, CA 94118-2514

From:	lacarnes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lance Carnes
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Sunday, August 24, 2025 10:11:48 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Lance Carnes
722 Lombard St Apt 201 San Francisco, CA 94133-2371

From: selizabethvaughan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Vaughan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Monday, August 25, 2025 5:16:20 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

I live in the Richmond District of San Francisco in a rent-stabilized apartment. I am surrounded by small businesses -- a tailor, groceries, cafes, restaurants -- in one- to two-story buildings. What happens to them if property owners decide to sell to developers? What happens to our community? Who would want to live in a "community" without small businesses that keep our neighborhood economically vibrant and interesting?

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Susan Vaughan
2120 Clement St San Francisco, CA 94121-2022

From:	cdamkroger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Courtney Damkroger
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Monday, August 25, 2025 11:54:47 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
Please take this opportunity to demonstrate your leadership in the Assembly and speak up for your city.

Sincerely,
Courtney Damkroger
2626 Hyde St San Francisco, CA 94109-1221

From: paulamccabe64@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paula Mc Cabe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Monday, August 25, 2025 12:37:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Paula Mc Cabe
8 Napier Ln San Francisco, CA 94133-3214

From: mauricefisher13@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maurice Fisher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Monday, August 25, 2025 3:32:46 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Maurice Fisher
578 7th Ave San Francisco, CA 94118-3819

From: dadaray2002@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Ray
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Monday, August 25, 2025 3:34:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: I have lived in San Francisco over 50 years and remember seeing the area of the Fillmore district that was demolished to make way for "redevelopment" which displaced many long time residents who were then unable to return to the area. The area had blocks and blocks of empty lots. It displaced a once vibrant neighborhood and has now been seen as the wrong way to have proceeded. The local people had no input into what was done in their area. For years we residents have resisted these one size fits all, top-down stupid "development" plans. I want to see real affordable housing and SB 79 pretends that it will provide housing and equity and does neither. It is a give a way to big real estate interests. City leaders in Los Angeles have seen what the language really means and have opposed it, San Francisco should do the same.

Sincerely,
Linda Ray
454 Lombard St Apt 5 San Francisco, CA 94133-2437

From: larry@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Larry Habegger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Monday, August 25, 2025 4:48:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live in San Francisco and have voted for Scott Wiener more than once, but Scott, I cannot support this bill of yours and I will not vote for you again if you proceed with this terrible legislation. We have an affordability crisis here, not a housing crisis. Thousands of units sit vacant because they were built as speculation and are unaffordable. Building more unaffordable units will do nothing to help our housing situation but will destroy the character of our neighborhoods. I ask assembly members Haney and Stefani to oppose this legislation as well. Mayor Lurie, please reconsider your position on this plan. Planning Commission, please reject it. Let's create a plan that gives us true affordability and preserves our neighborhoods.

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Larry Habegger
8 Napier Ln San Francisco, CA 94133-3214

From: ehirst1603@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eileen Hirst
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Monday, August 25, 2025 5:11:59 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Assemblymember Stefani --

I write to urge you to oppose SB 79.

As former chief of staff at the San Francisco Sheriff's Department, affordable housing is, to me, first and foremost, a public safety issue. You know as well as I do from your years on the Board of Supervisors that the greatest obstacle to public safety retention in San Francisco is the lack of affordable housing for deputy sheriffs, police officers, and fire fighters, as well as doctors, nurses and emergency responders. SB 79 will do nothing to alleviate this.

For those workers who choose to endure long commutes to serve the people of San Francisco, distance to the City from their affordable homes in far away counties -- and, in some cases, states -- means they are unable to respond to a major earthquake, fire, tsunami or other civic emergency. SB 79 thus endangers the lives of all San Francisco residents.

Rather than impose blanket upzoning that will result in haphazard development of more glass boxes that remain empty, why not thoughtfully identify parcels that can be redeveloped into truly affordable, family-appropriate housing for the workers who ensure our safety, and then work to remove permitting challenges to getting it built?

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Eileen Hirst
1248 Filbert St San Francisco, CA 94109-1714

From: mariacatherine22@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maria La Place
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Monday, August 25, 2025 5:31:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I fully support the following message:

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Scott Weiner has been carrying water for billionaire developers for years. Now his wealthy donors are being rewarded for all the money they spent on him: a bill that, at a stroke, deprives cities and communities from any say so about which buildings are destroyed and which are built in their city. This bill poses as a housing solution, but how can it be when there are no affordability requirements, no architectural requirements, no height limits, and no environmental review? This is just a blank check for developers to continue to gentrify, uglify, and wreck existing communities by displacing them with buildings they cannot afford to live in. And ruin the beauty of our city with faceless, sterile cookie cutter buildings which will block views and become enclaves of the wealthy.

Los Angeles politicians clearly saw that this was a dangerous piece of legislation and opposed it. But San Francisco is so corrupt now, so bought off with tech, developer, and big landlord money that they abandoned their city to the 50 billionaires who live here. Rather like the Democrats in the California Senate. Now, we'll see if the State Assembley is similarly bought off. (We already know the Mayor is the complete Oligarch). Either you stand with and protect your community from the predatory greed of developers or you abandon us. We will remember how you voted the next time you are up for reelection.

Your vote on this will have an impact on the next time you are up for election.

Sincerely,
Maria La Place
2855 Union St San Francisco, CA 94123-3809

From: jeanine@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanine Hawk
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Monday, August 25, 2025 6:09:02 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Jeanine Hawk
2001 9th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-1302

From: darrell.l.jan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Darrell Jan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Monday, August 25, 2025 6:09:53 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Darrell Jan
2001 9th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-1302

From: rolandgreedy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Roland Greedy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Monday, August 25, 2025 11:06:56 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Roland Greedy
1361 Broadway San Francisco, CA 94109-2632

From: matt.uzi.ak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mike Matusiak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Monday, August 25, 2025 11:53:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Mike Matusiak
2402 California St San Francisco, CA 94115-2656

From: jwiggsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jessia Stein
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 10:05:27 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

As a San Francisco native raising my kids in the city, I do not support this housing "solution." Please reconsider passing.

Sincerely,
Jessia Stein
255 Corona St San Francisco, CA 94127-2800

From: lakkisf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fadi Lakkis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 2:22:46 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
I support protecting the character of San Francisco, a unique gem in the whole wide world. There's is nothing like it and the reason my wife and I permanently located here very recently. Upzoning stands to benefit developers who are interested in short-term profits by building monstrosities in high real estate neighborhoods, and not in helping provide affordable housing. There are plenty of empty buildings in the financial district, downtown and south of market. They can re-purposed and refurbished. Please do not sell out the city to greed and to people not interested in the long-term wellbeing of SF. Hasn't the past taught SF enough about the greedy short-term types?
Thank you.
Fadi Lakkis

Sincerely,
Fadi Lakkis
1144 Broadway San Francisco, CA 94109-2162

From: olivianav@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Olivia Nava
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 4:45:53 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Olivia Nava
366 Funston Ave San Francisco, CA 94118-2116

From: nicolagriffin57@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nicola Griffin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 9:23:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: I have lived in the city since 1983 and I never cease to be amazed at the way greed takes over the approach to housing. We absolutely cannot do any more up-zoning until every single homeless person is housed.

Sincerely,
Nicola Griffin
101 Prentiss St San Francisco, CA 94110-5729

From: JOHNCRABTREE52@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Crabtree
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 1:56:11 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: I urge you to vote NO on SB 79!

https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://crabtreej.substack.com/p/a-blueprint-for-displacement___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo3OTY2OGJhZDVjZWU5NDg4NTFjZWE5M2FlYmZlYmYwMTo3OjkyMjc6MTc2ZTVhNGFkMjg5N2I5NzkxMjkxZjNmMjViZGU0MTE2N2FhN2Y5NWEyNzMxNGRkN2FhMjU1YzNjMjU4OTUwNzpwOlQ6Tg

Sincerely,
John Crabtree
1375 35th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-1328

From: cherylherms@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cheryl Herms
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 1:52:48 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Cheryl Herms
531 Hawthorne Ct Los Altos, CA 94024-3121

From: epml@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Larsen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 1:52:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Michael Larsen
1029 Jones St San Francisco, CA 94109-5023

From: angieschuppek@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Angelique Schuppek
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 1:53:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: I am a long-time resident of SF. I love our neighborhoods! I have lived in 5 different, distinct neighborhods during my adult life and don't want the character of SF to change. Especially my neighborhood of North Beach would be destroyed if owners were able to erect high-rise buildings. Please vote NO on SB 79. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Angelique Schuppek
1760 Mason St San Francisco, CA 94133-2724

From:	platzman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Steven Platzman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 1:54:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
Why not use available land sensibly. Issue building permits more efficiently. But maintain the current scale of permissible buildings . Bi . And maintain what is special about sf. The feel of neighborhoods . Big is not better.

Sincerely,
Steven Platzman
2446 Green St San Francisco, CA 94123-4627

From:	rosetaylor@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rose Taylor
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 1:54:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
This is ridiculous, this does nothing to address genuine issues and housing problems in our city, it's a money grab for developers and big money interest. We do not need this and it will ruin our city and not help those who are desperately in need.

Sincerely,
Rose Taylor
601 29th St San Francisco, CA 94131-2205

From: susanmackowski@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Mackowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 1:55:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Let communities decide what they want their neighborhoods to be. San Francisco is declining in population -we don't need the character of our wonderful neighborhoods destroyed by buildings that home owners don't want and only those in upper income brackets can afford. (The 15% or so of housing deemed 'affordable' is not nearly enough, nor does it accommodate those not making substantial salaries.)

These high rises do nothing to address the needs of the existing population. Yes, they appeal to the young and mobile -the very people who have the most choices available when it comes to where to live and how.

SB 79 is government telling citizens what to do -and it's out of line.

Sincerely,
Susan Mackowski
260 Chestnut St San Francisco, CA 94133-2407

From: marinamorenous@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marina Moreno
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 1:55:58 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 resident of San Francisco since 1988, and a property owner in San Francisco since 1999.

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Please be sensible and address the other issues that have stood in the way of expanding housing options in the City first, before you go blanketing stupid demolitions and erratic location of extra tall buildings throughout our beautiful City without significant benefits to low income people.

Sincerely,
Marina Moreno
201 Quintara St San Francisco, CA 94116-1362

From: gb_andrews@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gandhia Andrews
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 1:57:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: You all know better: This is nothing but a developer scam. Don't be a part of corrupt politics. Do the right thing and Vote No!

Sincerely,
Gandhia Andrews
5 Diaz Ave San Francisco, CA 94132-2434

From: kumasong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Kirschling
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 1:57:55 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Kirschling
633 Oak St San Francisco, CA 94117-2655

From: paulagiants@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paula Katz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Vote NO on SB 79! It"s Not Right for Us
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 1:59:02 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My friends and I are so opposed to SB79, and we urge you to vote no on it. It will be terrible for our neighborhoods.

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: There are many approved housing projects that are not being built. The focus should be on those. Don't ruin our neighborhoods by allowing these tall buildings that block our views. It's our quality of life. Many of us bought our homes because we could see out. Putting a big wall with tall buildings would be horrible. Don't do this to your constituents. Please vote No on SB79.

Sincerely,
Paula Katz
2233 44th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-1534

From: corex123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Kaytun
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 1:59:56 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
Please, don't let real estate developers ruin the same city we all love and care about.
Special interests baking our state Senator Scott Weiner has been behind SB79. It will destroy SF and displace residents and businesses to be replaced by new luxury condo residents. It won't create affordable housing, it will line pockets of wealthy donors behind Scott Weiner and ensure more champagne contributions. .
Please, vote NO!!!

Sincerely,
Diana Kaytun
783 La Playa St Apt 1 San Francisco, CA 94121-3370

From: avamcleod@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ava Ray McLeod
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:00:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Ava Ray McLeod
569 Greenwich St San Francisco, CA 94133-2917

From: danandkaren4@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Earl Lovelace
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:00:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Earl Lovelace
7372 Padova Dr Goleta, CA 93117-1318

From: gregorystevensw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gregory Stevens
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:01:02 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Gregory Stevens
277 19th Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-2302

From: sandraline@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sandraline Cederwall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:01:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: I have lived in Cow Hollow near the Presidio for 35 years. Traffic to and from the Golden Gate Bridge is heavy most of the time. Adding high rise units without being able to seriously widen lanes to & from and ON the GGBridge is totally irresponsible and crazy. It will ruin the neighborhoods on either side of Lombard and create awful traffic jams. This area cannot accommodate what SB 79 proposes. PLEASE VOTE NO! for everyone's sake!

Sincerely,
Sandraline Cederwall
2703 Broderick St San Francisco, CA 94123-3803

From:	llakkis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Lakkis
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:01:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: San Francisco must be preserved. There is no other city like it. If you build 14 story apartment buildings in Pacific Heights, it is not going to help the housing problem. It will be a way for developers to make lots of money selling luxury apartments that are NOT for families and it will cause traffic and congestion in an area that S.F. should treasure and preserve.

Sincerely,
Lisa Lakkis
1870 Jackson St San Francisco, CA 94109-2864

From: FredPenczakMD@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fred Penczak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:02:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: We already have the legislation in place that represents our communities. Overriding these laws are by definition abandoning your constituents. Thank you, Fred

Sincerely,
Fred Penczak
78 Creekside Dr San Rafael, CA 94903-1055

From: mark_keleher@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mark Keleher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:02:33 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Mark Keleher
1731 Vallejo St San Francisco, CA 94123-5008

From: erinjhill@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erin Hill
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:03:04 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Former San Francisco resident.

Sincerely,
Erin Hill
3577 Akron St Denver, CO 80238-3399

From: mbradley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Bradley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:03:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: We have lived in our home in the Cow Hollow neighborhood for almost 40 years and raised our family here. If San Francisco had been like what SB 79 now envisions we would never have stayed here. Turning San Francisco into a West Coast Manhattan will be a tragedy which won't be able to undo.

Sincerely,
Michael Bradley
2636 Filbert St San Francisco, CA 94123-3216

From: kwaldron333@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of kyra waldron
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:05:03 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

SB 79 will not deliver affordability. Instead, it will displace tenants, drive out small businesses, and destroy the very qualities that make San Francisco livable and beloved, all while handing unprecedented profits to developers and investors. Our state and local leaders have forgotten who they serve.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
kyra waldron
2307 John St Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-2615

From: ThomasWeed@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Thomas Weed
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:06:08 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Thomas Weed
360 32nd Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-1769

From: noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:10:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: I do not want my neighborhood, or nearby Commercial Corridors to by overbuilt. Please stop the overbuilding.

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
942 Teresita Blvd San Francisco, CA 94127-2325

From: kh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of kaivan harouni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:10:28 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
kaivan harouni
3623 Ballina Canyon Rd Encino, CA 91436-4109

From: maureenmartineau4@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maureen Martineau
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:10:29 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
San Francisco is an iconic charming place to visit and obviously to live and work in.. Don't let greed ruin it!

Sincerely,
Maureen Martineau
5502 Graylog St Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275-1732

From:	jlansing@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James Lansing
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:12:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
James Lansing
1048 Union St Apt 7 San Francisco, CA 94133-2599

From:	timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Robert Smith
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:13:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: Please stop "pandering" to the YIMBY paid lobbyists.

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
942 Teresita Blvd San Francisco, CA 94127-2325

From: BigWayne19@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wayne Phillips
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:14:28 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: if this passes, i don't want orinda to copy SF . . .

Sincerely,
Wayne Phillips
58 Bates Blvd Orinda, CA 94563-2816

From:	jim-connelly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of jim connelly
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!!!!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:16:00 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

This bill will negatively transform San Francisco's Cow Hollow neighborhood and every neighborhood the touches the Union Street transportation corridor.

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
jim connelly
1713 Green St San Francisco, CA 94123-4919

From:	geokimm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Flo and George Kimmerling
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:16:29 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Flo and George Kimmerling
1282 26th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-1505

From: sheiladowell@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sheila Dowell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:19:25 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: Please, Please, Please understand and appreciate how very important it is to VOTE NO on SB 79! Mayor Luire, in particular - do you want this as your legacy - the complete desecration of San Francisco?!

This bill is being "slipped under the door" - I am shocked at how few San Franciscans are even aware of it.

Thank you - in advance - for your engagement with stopping this bill.

Sheila Dowell
Resident and Voter, San Francisco

Sincerely,
Sheila Dowell
2480 Filbert St San Francisco, CA 94123-3316

From:	elizbreilly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elizabeth Reilly
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:22:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Reilly
1791 Green St San Francisco, CA 94123-4959

From: danolley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Nolley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:22:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a "blueprint" for displacement of those of us who've lived in our polite neighborhood, with its quaint and highly individualized residences, a few like ours that was built back in 1908 with bricks and materials that had been left after the 06 earthquake. SB is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to those of us San Franciscans who've lived in these neighborhoods for decades, and includes no real affordability requirements for those who toil for a living wage. We're retired, fortunately, and paid off our home many years ago and, now in our 80's, we're safe where we are, as are our neighbors. Please stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79. Thank you, David n Nancy

Sincerely,
David Nolley
1754 Great Hwy San Francisco, CA 94122-3923

From:	sheririchmond45@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sheri Richmond
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:24:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB

Sincerely,
Sheri Richmond
2647 Lombard St San Francisco, CA 94123-2409

From: scarampi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebastiano Scarampi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:25:28 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

I will NEVER vote again for you if you vote YES on SB 79

Sincerely,
Sebastiano Scarampi
3127 Jackson St San Francisco, CA 94115-1019

From: judydoanesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judy Doane
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:32:08 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
My husband and I have lived in SF since 1970, and we are supporters of SF in every way. Housing is a necessity and affordable housing is what we need…not expensive tall buildings thrown up just to say we meet the numbers required by the state. We, the residents of SF, know what is needed here and it is not more housing for the top $ earners in our community. People who just want to live and work in the city deserve our attention and a place to call home here in SF.

Sincerely,
Judy Doane
3101 California St San Francisco, CA 94115-2409

From: rozgilyoung@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rosilyn Young
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:33:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Rosilyn Young
130 San Fernando Way San Francisco, CA 94127-1945

From:	susankettel@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Kettel
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:34:37 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
Los Angeles worries too:
If Los Angeles does have the highest rate of homelessness, SB 79 will not help.
Why?
Because it's been impossible to pass laws to help the neediest of humans lying on our streets, suffering from mental illness, drug addiction, physical pain with no home or income. These fellow humans need our help and kindness, not SB 79 and more housing built (which, by the way, is very convenient in our 2028 Olympic Los Angeles Hosting gig, which is on Newsom and probably every other California politician and building contractor's greedy mind.
The homeless, unsheltered, mentally ill, drug addicted, need a humane law passed to bring them into hospitals for humane treatment and to keep them safe.
SB 79 is not the answer.
We all know the thousand and thousands of apartments and small homes supposedly built to get the ill and homeless off the streets has never worked because the number one requirement is: no drugs, no alcohol.
People who are self medicating because of pain or the physical and emotional brutality life inflicts on some of our weakest humans, will always choose the numbing effects of drugs or alcohol.
So let's not blame the lack of housing on the homeless situation.
We don't need SB 79.
There are plenty of vacant apartments and condos and small homes (and shelters and they are terrified to go into shelters because of the crime and physicial assaults and thefts) waiting for homeless humans, but they are refused entry due to their drug and alcohol use.
So, please let's actually do something humane and help our fellow humans who are deeply suffering.
No one needs SB 79's new apartments built next to transit stops, except the greedy politicians and construction companies who will benefit from the 2028 Olympics housing. And ask yourself, what happens after the summer of 2028 is gone and all the occupants of the Metro apartments move out and back to their own countries. What will become of the empty apartments?
Quoting: "Los Angeles has the highest rate of homelessness, the worst housing overcrowding, some of the highest housing costs and among the longest, most polluting commutes in the United States – and its city leaders have just demonstrated once again that they could not care less," Hanlon said." Only parts of this is true. We have the highest rate of homelessness, and my statement above explains the solution and the cause.
We have the highest cost because of our weather! Everyone who has ever visited California knows this fact, we live in an ideal climate. This is why the housing is so high. If you want lower housing - go to Montana, West Virginia, Oklahoma, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Ohio. The weather might be harsh - but if the YIMBY's really care about affordable housing, go to these states and begin your campaign to start affordable apartments for low income and homeless.
But that's not what the greedy politicians and YIMBY's want. And YIMBY really stands for YIYBY Yes In Your Back Yard.

The state of California needs to intervene to protect Angelenos from their greedy leaders, please stop SB 79. They only care about the 2028 Olympic conditions in their city. This is exactly why we need the state to refuse and fail SB 79.
SB 79 is an 2028 Olympic bill. It applies only near major transit stops like the Metro for easy Olympic guests transportation, and it guarantees local construction companies have jobs for the next 4 years.
Thank you,
Susan Kettel

Sincerely,
Susan Kettel
5351 Bayridge Rd Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275-1711

From: kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:35:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
PO Box 14350 San Francisco, CA 94114-0350

From: lilyffll90@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lily Leung
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:35:34 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Lily Leung
1106 Bismarck Ln Alameda, CA 94502-6936

From: susankettel@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Kettel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:35:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
Los Angeles worries too:
If Los Angeles does have the highest rate of homelessness, SB 79 will not help.
Why?
Because it's been impossible to pass laws to help the neediest of humans lying on our streets, suffering from mental illness, drug addiction, physical pain with no home or income. These fellow humans need our help and kindness, not SB 79 and more housing built (which, by the way, is very convenient in our 2028 Olympic Los Angeles Hosting gig, which is on Newsom and probably every other California politician and building contractor's greedy mind.
The homeless, unsheltered, mentally ill, drug addicted, need a humane law passed to bring them into hospitals for humane treatment and to keep them safe.
SB 79 is not the answer.
We all know the thousand and thousands of apartments and small homes supposedly built to get the ill and homeless off the streets has never worked because the number one requirement is: no drugs, no alcohol.
People who are self medicating because of pain or the physical and emotional brutality life inflicts on some of our weakest humans, will always choose the numbing effects of drugs or alcohol.
So let's not blame the lack of housing on the homeless situation.
We don't need SB 79.
There are plenty of vacant apartments and condos and small homes (and shelters and they are terrified to go into shelters because of the crime and physicial assaults and thefts) waiting for homeless humans, but they are refused entry due to their drug and alcohol use.
So, please let's actually do something humane and help our fellow humans who are deeply suffering.
No one needs SB 79's new apartments built next to transit stops, except the greedy politicians and construction companies who will benefit from the 2028 Olympics housing. And ask yourself, what happens after the summer of 2028 is gone and all the occupants of the Metro apartments move out and back to their own countries. What will become of the empty apartments?
Quoting: "Los Angeles has the highest rate of homelessness, the worst housing overcrowding, some of the highest housing costs and among the longest, most polluting commutes in the United States – and its city leaders have just demonstrated once again that they could not care less," Hanlon said." Only parts of this is true. We have the highest rate of homelessness, and my statement above explains the solution and the cause.
We have the highest cost because of our weather! Everyone who has ever visited California knows this fact, we live in an ideal climate. This is why the housing is so high. If you want lower housing - go to Montana, West Virginia, Oklahoma, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Ohio. The weather might be harsh - but if the YIMBY's really care about affordable housing, go to these states and begin your campaign to start affordable apartments for low income and homeless.
But that's not what the greedy politicians and YIMBY's want. And YIMBY really stands for YIYBY Yes In Your Back Yard.

The state of California needs to intervene to protect Angelenos from their greedy leaders, please stop SB 79. They only care about the 2028 Olympic conditions in their city. This is exactly why we need the state to refuse and fail SB 79.
SB 79 is an 2028 Olympic bill. It applies only near major transit stops like the Metro for easy Olympic guests transportation, and it guarantees local construction companies have jobs for the next 4 years.
Thank you,
Susan Kettel

Sincerely,
Susan Kettel
5351 Bayridge Rd Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275-1711

From: lilyffll90@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lily Leung
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:37:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Lily Leung
1106 Bismarck Ln Alameda, CA 94502-6936

From: frankblanket@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Derrick Scocchera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:39:23 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
As a 33 year resident and renter in San Francisco, I strongly oppose SB 79 and Billionaire Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. San Francisco is one of the few cities left in this country with distinctive neighbors, and this short sighted cash grab turns it into another generic, completely unaffordable city. Not only is it bad for the people that call this place home, it's bad for tourism, which is still one of our greatest sources of revenue. Who wants to come to a city where the landmarks and charm are obscured by endless cookie cutter condos and office buildings. Gentrification isn't renewal, it's destruction, and the evidence is plain to see in countless other communities.

Sincerely,
Derrick Scocchera
377 Chestnut St San Francisco, CA 94133-2422

From: tesw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tes Welborn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:39:38 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 home owner in the Haight. There are many shops and restaurants on Haight Street that I patronize. Many have residents above, and others are single story buildings. These neighbors often live in 100 year old buildings and have rent control. They would be evicted, lose their housing, and their community.

All the restaurants and shops, and particularly in single story buildings, could be evicted, and often have to close. We'd lose the businesses we enjoy in our neighborhood.

SB 79 gives property owners a windfall increase in value, rather than protecting our neighbors.
SB 79 encourages market rate housing at the expense of currently affordable homes and apartments.
It offers only a pittance of so-called affordable housing.

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

What we need is state funding for truly affordable housing!

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Tes Welborn
2001 Oak St San Francisco, CA 94117-1802

From: erikashe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erika Shershun
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:50:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Erika Shershun
2028 Hyde St Apt 2 San Francisco, CA 94109-1743

From: crimlaw5@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gail Harper
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:51:08 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments: Do not touch North Beach or Telegraph Hill!

Sincerely,
Gail Harper
350 Bay St Ste Pm 100 San Francisco, CA 94133-1998

From:	mmazgai@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Mazgai
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:51:21 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Michael Mazgai
642 Broderick St San Francisco, CA 94117-1412

From:	noble.angulo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sabine Angulo
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:07:29 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
Don't block the sun in residential neighborhoods where families and children play. We have invested our whole savings to live in the tight community of outer Sunset where neighbors look out for one another. Eight story buildings don't attract the neighborly vibe we came here for. We don't want to live in the shadows of these high rise buildings.

Sincerely,
Sabine Angulo
1587 40th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-3029

From: braeniac@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip Braen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:10:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

This bill only benefits developers and will destroy our neighborhoods. There are much better ways to address the housing problem.

Philip Braen
439 S Citrus Ave
Los Angeles, CA
90026
La Brea-Hancock

Sincerely,
Philip Braen
439 S Citrus Ave Los Angeles, CA 90036-3536

From:	jherrod9@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Julie Herrod-Lumsden
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	YOU MUST VOTE NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:10:48 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a shameful blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:
Wiener has betrayed us before. Why would you let him do it again?

Sincerely,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
553 A Greenwich St San Francisco, CA 94133-7128

From: esthermk@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Esther Marks
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:14:55 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is a blanket upzoning bill that will potentially displace any non homeowner. Remember who elected you. NOT Scott Wiener

Sincerely,
Esther Marks
125 Upper Ter San Francisco, CA 94117-4513

From: mmammini@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michelle Mammini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:15:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As representatives of individual homeowners like me SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Michelle Mammini
2520 Greenwich St San Francisco, CA 94123-3308

From: ademas1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anita Demas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:15:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

This legislation is appalling and fundamentally changes the structure of SF.

Sincerely,
Anita Demas
3349 Washington St San Francisco, CA 94118-2033

From: shashacooks@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anastasia Yovanopoulos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:20:45 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Vote NO on SB 79!

Dear elected official,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
3718 24th St San Francisco, CA 94114-3942

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
3718 24th St San Francisco, CA 94114-3942

From: pattired12@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patti McMahon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:22:12 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements. The first area to be developed for additional housing are the empty office buildings in our downtown area. Once this has been started then the neighborhood plans can be started.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Patti McMahon
6620 Geary Blvd San Francisco, CA 94121-1787

From: madatian.j@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jasmine Madatian
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:22:35 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Jasmine Madatian
2471 24th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-2336

From: pgw0856@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Ward
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:30:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Patricia Ward
4184 Lafayette Pl Culver City, CA 90232-2818

From: jacamp313@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jerome Camp
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:33:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Jerome Camp
1216 Woodview Ter Los Altos, CA 94024-7046

From:	jmarshall@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of JANE MARSHALL
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79 - This is not a housing solution!!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:34:39 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 provides a blanket upzoning bill to RUIN NEIGHBORHOODS giving developers a free pass to exploit our unique neighborhoods for high price rents that push out people that they are trying to help!

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
JANE MARSHALL
603 Seagaze Dr Oceanside, CA 92054-3005

From:	eblarkin7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elaine Larkin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:40:48 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

14 + towers is just ridiculous. You are destroying what makes San Francisco, San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Elaine Larkin
2648 Union St San Francisco, CA 94123-3817

From: bdbaddog@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of William Deegan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:41:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it’s a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

While I applaud some of the motives of this bill, once again Sacramento is trying to solve a problem with a far too broad "solution".

Please vote NO

Sincerely,
William Deegan
220 Lombard St Apt 214 San Francisco, CA 94111-1157

From: mleo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mary Lou Leo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:53:31 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Mary Lou Leo
800 Schumacher Dr Los Angeles, CA 90048-5344

From:	margaret@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Margaret Bradley-Foley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:56:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Margaret Bradley-Foley
2644 Filbert St San Francisco, CA 94123-3216

From:	jcfoley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jim Foley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vote NO on SB 79!
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:57:39 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Jim Foley
2644 Filbert St San Francisco, CA 94123-3216

From: carlwendorf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carl Wendorf
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:01:12 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Carl Wendorf
57 Rockwood Ct San Francisco, CA 94127-1031

From: cablecar@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Wesley Valaris
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:01:55 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Wesley Valaris
4025 Moraga St San Francisco, CA 94122-3927

From: thanos@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Athanassios Diacakis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:03:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Athanassios Diacakis
3830 18th St San Francisco, CA 94114-2616

From: francinemgrant@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of francine grant
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:08:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
francine grant
1930 Taylor St San Francisco, CA 94133-2612

From: litagent@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cherie Fehrman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:12:54 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79.

Additional Comments:

San Francisco is not Manhattan nor should it be. We live in earthquake country and towers should not be given priority in an area with fault lines. Developers consistently alter things, most often not for the better, and then return to where they live, often leaving eyesores and shoddy construction behind them, i.e. the Millennium Tower. Please vote for sanity - NO on SB 79.

Sincerely,
Cherie Fehrman
3701 Sacramento St # 343 San Francisco, CA 94118-1705

From: donna.howe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Howe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on SB 79!
Date: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:24:46 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 lifelong resident (71 years) of San Francisco, I am so disappointed that you, or elected and appointed representatives have not truly engaged all stakeholders in achieving a solution to affordable housing in San Francisco.

Informing us is not the same things as involving us. Like The Family Zoning Plan, SB 79 is not a housing solution — it's a blueprint for displacement.

It is a blanket upzoning bill that hands power to developers, fuels demolitions and gentrification, breaks promises to San Francisco neighborhoods, and includes no real affordability requirements.

Stand with Your Constituents and vote NO on SB 79. We pay your salaries, and we expect your consideration.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely,
Donna Howe
85 Entrada Ct San Francisco, CA 94127-2814

Item 77

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); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	File No. 250783 - 2 letters
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 12:32:20 PM
Attachments:	File No 250783 Landmark Mint Mall and Hall 2 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached two letters from members of the public regarding:

> File No. 250783, Resolution No. 394-25 - Resolution initiating a landmark designation under Article 10 of the Planning Code of The Mint Mall and Hall at 951-957 Mission Street at the south side of Mission Street between 5th and 6th Streets.

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:	Michael Nulty
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS)
Subject:	File No. 250783 Resolution initiating a landmark designation under Article 10 of the Planning Code of The Mint Mall and Hall at 951-957 Mission Street at the south side of Mission Street between 5th and 6th Streets.
Date:	Saturday, August 23, 2025 4:04:26 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:

The Alliance for a Better District 6 is in full support of resolution initiating a landmark designation under Article 10 of the Planning Code of The Mint Mall and Hall at 951-957 Mission Street at the south side of Mission Street between 5th and 6th Streets.

The building at 951-957 Mission, known as Mint Mall and Hall, is prominently situated within the SoMa Pilipinas - Filipino Cultural Heritage District, a designation that is strongly supported by its Cultural History, Housing and Economic Sustainability Strategy (CHHESS) report. This area is recognized for its rich cultural significance and the vibrant contributions of its residents, who together create a unique tapestry that reflects the Filipino community's heritage and contemporary experiences. The Mint Mall, which encompasses the basement, ground floor, and mezzanine, along with the Hall that occupies the upper residential floors, are of great cultural importance, as they are home to a high proportion of Filipino residents who contribute to the community's unique character and identity through their diverse backgrounds, traditions, and shared experiences.

The Mint Mall and Hall derive their significance not only from their physical presence but also from their historical role as sites for numerous culturally significant events and activities that resonate deeply within the Filipino community. These spaces serve as vital cultural hubs where individuals gather to celebrate their heritage, share stories, and engage in various artistic expressions, creating a dynamic environment that fosters connections among community members. Over the years, these venues have served as essential gathering points, fostering a sense of belonging and cultural pride among residents. They have been the backdrop for a variety of Filipino cultural and arts organizations, which have played a critical role in promoting Filipino heritage and arts through workshops, performances, and exhibitions that highlight the richness of Filipino culture.

Additionally, many community-serving non-profits and small businesses, both past and present, have called this location home, further enriching the cultural landscape and providing vital services to the community. These organizations not only support the economic sustainability of the area but also empower residents by offering resources, education, and outreach programs that address the specific needs of the Filipino community. This site embodies a significant aspect of intangible cultural heritage, reflecting the traditions, values, and collective memories of the Filipino community in the area, serving as a living testament to the resilience and creativity of its people, and reinforcing the importance of preserving such cultural landmarks for future generations.

Any questions regarding this letter please e-mail us.

In solidarity,

Michael Nulty
Executive Director
Alliance for a Better District 6

Michael Nulty

P.O. Box 420782
San Francisco, CA 94142-0782
(415) 339-8327 - Direct
(415) 339-8779 - Alliance for a Better District 6

http://abd6.cfsites.org/

From:	Lorenzo Listana
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	CPC-Commissions Secretary
Subject:	Re: Support letter for landmarking of Mint Mall and Hall (951-957 Mission St)
Date:	Tuesday, August 26, 2025 3:31:46 PM
Attachments:	image.png

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 express my strong support for the landmarking and historical preservation of the Mint Mall and Hall located at 951-957 Mission Street.

I am a SoMa resident, owner of a small company located in Mint Mall since 2007, and the Founding Director of the Filipino Community Development Corporation (FCDC), also located in Mint Mall.

I would like to request that you, Supervisors, approve the landmarking of Mint Mall and Hall for their historical and cultural significance in the SoMa Pilipinas Heritage District.

Maraming Salamat,

Lorenzo Listana

Co-owner, Aeroskin Worldwide
W: https://www.aeroskinworldwide.com/
Founding Director, Filipino Community Development Corporation (FCDC)
P: (415) 481-5181
W: https://filipinocdc.org/

Item 78

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); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: File No. 240803: Unauthorized and Rent-Controlled Dwelling Units
Date:	Thursday, August 28, 2025 2:17:28 PM
Attachments:	SFAA Opposition Letter File No. 240803.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached from the San Francisco Apartment Association regarding:

> **File No. 240803** - Ordinance amending the Planning Code to require applicants to disclose the presence of any Unauthorized Dwelling Unit, and require the Planning Department to investigate any Unauthorized Dwelling Unit, upon submittal of a Development Application; require the Planning Department to document when a property is subject to a regulatory agreement subjecting any units on the property to the San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance; and require the Planning Department to inspect properties prior to recommending approval of any loss of a Residential Unit or Unauthorized Dwelling Unit; amending the Building Code to expand the Department of Building Inspection's Expanded Compliance Control Program to address fraud, bribery, and failure to accurately represent the presence and number of Unauthorized Dwelling Units at properties subject to a permit application; 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 findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare pursuant to Planning Code, Section 302.

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: Charley Goss <charley@sfaa.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 4:12 PM
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Janan New <janan@sfaa.org>
Subject: File No. 240803: Unauthorized and Rent-Controlled Dwelling Units

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

Hi Supervisor Melgar, Members of the Board of Supervisors, and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

Attached please find a letter from the San Francisco Apartment Association objecting to proposed Ordinance No. 240803, "Unauthorized and Rent-Controlled Dwelling Units."

Please do not hesitate to reach out if you have any questions or concerns.

Best,

Charley Goss
Government and Community Affairs Manager
San Francisco Apartment Association
415.255.2288 ext. 114

San Francisco Apartment Association

Supervisor Myrna Melgar
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

VIA EMAIL

RE: Proposed San Francisco Ordinance No. 240803

Dear Supervisor Melgar and Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors:

The San Francisco Apartment Association (SFAA) hereby writes to object to proposed San Francisco Ordinance No. 240803 (the "Ordinance"), which SFAA understands will be considered by the Board for final passage on September 2, 2025. As drafted, the Ordinance conflicts with the California statutory scheme for issuance of administrative warrants & the California Ellis Act, and violates protections against unreasonable searches and excessive fines under the California and U.S. Constitutions.

In pertinent part, the Ordinance proposes to amend the Planning Code to require project applicants to:

(1) Provide extensive information about the existence or nonexistence of Unauthorized Dwelling Units(s) (UDUs) at the subject property ("**Disclosure Requirement**");

(2) Allows the Planning Department to "investigate" and "inspect" properties where they suspect there are undisclosed UDUs present ("**Warrantless Search**"); and

(3) Imposes *significant* penalties—up to $150,000.00—for suspected misrepresentation of UDU or related tenant history at the subject property ("**Penalty**").

First, San Francisco (the "City") cannot vest in itself the power to invoke unauthorized, warrantless property searches. When a property owner refuses to permit a local official from conducting a property search, that local official is *required* to seek an administrative warrant from the superior court allowing such inspection, which may then only be executed under the strict terms of that court-issued warrant. (Civ. Code § 1822.50 et seq.) Further, such administrative warrants are mandatory under the California and U.S. Constitutions, and no statute—or local ordinance—can excuse compliance. (U.S. Const. Amend. 4.; also see, *Camara v. Mun. Ct. of City & Cnty. of San Francisco* (1967) 387 U.S. 523, 534; CA Constitution art I § 13.)

The Ordinance's Warrantless Search provisions permit and/ or require property inspections—even without property owners' consent—if information provided by project applicants lead the Planning Department to believe a UDU at the subject property exists. This locally sanctioned Warrantless Search therefore not only conflicts with California's statutory scheme addressing

administrative warrant requirements, but violates constitutional protections against unreasonable searches.

Moreover, by purportedly overriding this statutory and constitutional requirement, the City interferes with the judiciary's ability to consider and/or issue administrative warrants, thereby violating the judicial powers doctrine. (See, e.g., *Smith v. Superior Court* (2020) 52 Cal.App.5th 57; *McHugh v. Santa Monica Rent Control Bd.* (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 348, 355 [Rent Board violated judicial powers doctrine by awarding treble damages].)

Next, the Ordinance conflicts with the Ellis Act, and is therefore preempted thereby. The City's stated goal in preserving residential units, including UDUs, is ensuring adequate *rental* housing stock. (Planning Code § 317(a).) That goal is preempted following removal of a UDU from the rental market through an Ellis Act eviction; the constraints control. The Ordinance requires all project applicants—even those that have invoked their right under the Ellis Act—to disclose whether any UDU exists at the Property. If those applicants get the Disclosure Requirement or any portion of the property's tenant history wrong, they are faced with the Warrantless Search, and/or the Penalty and related enforcement despite the fact that the City cannot require an applicant to rent after withdrawal. By creating a Disclosure Requirement for withdrawn UDUs and related searches, enforcement and penalties if the withdrawing project applicant "gets it wrong," the Ordinance unlawfully enters a field of substantive eviction controls over landlords desiring to exit the residential rental market.

Finally, the Ordinance's Penalty separately violates the Excessive Fines Clauses of the California and U.S. Constitutions. (U.S. Const. Amend. 4.; *Thomas v. Cnty. of Humboldt, California* (9th Cir. 2024) 124 F.4th 1179, 1193; CA Constitution art I § 17.) The Penalty is plainly punitive and targets alleged "offenders" with zero to little legal culpability. Moreover, it should be noted that even if the Penalty purports to serve some remedial purpose, this does not save it. (*Thomas, supra,* 124 F.4th at p. 1193.)

Pursuant to the above, SFAA respectfully urges the Board to consider the aforesaid objections to the Ordinance, and vote against this patently illegal proposal.

Very truly yours,

SAN FRANCISCO APARTMENT ASSOCIATION

Janan New

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie

265 Ivy Street, San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 255-2288 Fax: (415) 255-1112 www.sfaa.org

Item 79

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: CommonSpirit Health
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 9:39:54 AM
Attachments: 0136_001.pdf

Hello,

In accordance with California Health and Safety Code, Section 130066.5, please see attached Structural Performance Category Ratings of Hospital Buildings Report, submitted by CommonSpirit Health.

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.*

CommonSpirit

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 AUG 18 PM 03:31

January 1, 2025

RE: *Annual Status Update on the Structural Performance Category Ratings of Hospital Buildings*

Enclosed please find the annual status update on the Structural Performance Category ratings of the hospital buildings and the services provided in each building on the hospital campuses set forth in the enclosed update.

This update is being provided pursuant to California Health and Safety Code (HSC) Section 130066.5 on the behalf of the owner of the hospital. You are receiving this update because your entity is identified in HSC Section 130066.5(b) to receive such updates.

If you have any questions regarding this update, please contact:

David Chacon
System Director, Project Delivery, California
National Real Estate Services
CommonSpirit Health
330 N. Brand Boulevard, Suite 400
Glendale, CA 91203
Email: *David.Chacon@CommonSpirit.org*

Sincerely,

COMMONSPIRIT HEALTH

Enclosure

12457 UCSF Health - Saint Francis Hospital

Bldg Num	Bldg Name	Applicable Year	Nursing Med Surg	Surgical	Anesthesia PACU	Clinical Lab	Imaging Radiological Diagnostic Imaging	Pharmacy	Dietetic	Administrative	Sterile Processing	General Storage	Morgue	Employee Dressing	Housekeeping EVS	Laundry Linen	Special Procedures	ICU CCU PICU	Burn Unit	Neonatal Intensive Care Unit	Pediatric Adolescent Nursing Unit	Psychiatric Nursing	Obstetrics Perinatal Unit	Emergency	Nuclear Medicine	Rehabilitation Therapy	Physical Rehabilitation Nursing Unit	Renal Dialysis	Respiratory	Intermediate Care	Outpatient Services	Skilled Nursing Unit	Central Plant Utility Bldg	Canopies Corridor Buildings Tunnels	Non GAC Uses	
BLD-01079	Main Tower	2024	X			X		X	X		X		X		X	X		X	X				X		X	X	X		X		X		X		Outpatient sports medicine s..	SPC: 2 NPC: 2 This building does not significantly jeopardize life, but may not be repaira..
BLD-01080	1958 Building	2024		X						X		X													X		X									Social Services	SPC: 2 NPC: 2 This building does not significantly jeopardize life, but may not be repaira..
BLD-01081	Pierotti Pavilion	2024		X	X		X							X			X									X							X			Oncology	SPC: 3s NPC: 2

12460 UCSF Health - St. Mary's Hospital

Bldg Num	Bldg Name	Applicable Year	Nursing Med Surg	Surgical	Anesthesia PACU	Clinical Lab	Imaging Radiological Diagnostic Imaging	Pharmacy	Dietetic	Administrative	Sterile Processing	General Storage	Morgue	Employee Dressing	Housekeeping EVS	Laundry Linen	Special Procedures	ICU CCU PICU	Burn Unit	Neonatal Intensive Care Unit	Pediatric Adolescent Nursing Unit	Psychiatric Nursing	Obstetrics Perinatal Unit	Emergency	Nuclear Medicine	Rehabilitation Therapy	Physical Rehabilitation Nursing Unit	Renal Dialysis	Respiratory	Intermediate Care	Outpatient Services	Skilled Nursing Unit	Central Plant Utility Bldg	Canopies Corridor Buildings Tunnels	Non GAC Uses	
BLD-01072	Main Tower	2024	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	X	X	X		X		X		X			SPC: 2 NPC: 3R This building does not significantly jeopardize life, but may not be repaira..
BLD-01073	McAuley Wing	2024																				X														SPC: 2 NPC: 2 This building does not significantly jeopardize life, but may not be repaira..

Item 80

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: citizen oversight of the Sherrif"s Office
Date:	Wednesday, August 20, 2025 2:40:33 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board.

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.

-----Original Message-----
From: Shoshanah Dobry <shoshod5623@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 11:43 AM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Cc: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: citizen oversight of the Sherrif's Office

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

Hello:

I just read that you &/or your office wants to stop the oversight. We in SF voted for this. Why are you both trying to starve the process by denying funding for this important function & also actually trying to eliminate it. I thought you ran on a platform to help SF be a better city. Instead you are seriously coming across as Trump-light.

Is this all a function of your wealthy upbringing, like Trump, so that you are not in touch with the everyday concerns & struggles of the average person living in SF? I find this truly puzzling. I really had great hopes for your new administration. I actually don’t know what to think about it anymore.

I would hope that you would reconsider your position.

Shoshanah Dobry

Item 81

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: FYI - Letter of Support for Director Henderson (DPA) sent to Police Commission
Date:	Wednesday, August 13, 2025 2:47:02 PM
Attachments:	Letter_of_Support_for_Director_Paul_Henderson.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached regarding the San Francisco Department of Police Accountability.

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: Anonymous <anonymous777123456@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 1:48 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Yep, Paul (POL) <Paul.Yep@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: FYI - Letter of Support for Director Henderson (DPA) sent to Police Commission

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

August 12, 2025

To:

San Francisco Police Commission
Interim Chief of Police Paul Yep
Mayor Daniel Lurie

Re: Strong Support for Director Paul Henderson's Leadership at the Department of Police Accountability

Dear President Clay, Commissioners, Chief Yep, and Mayor Lurie,

We are writing to express our strong support for Paul Henderson and his exemplary leadership of the San Francisco Department of Police Accountability. Recent media coverage has unfortunately amplified what appears to be a coordinated effort by a small minority of employees to undermine Director Henderson's authority through personal attacks rather than constructive engagement with the substantial reforms and improvements he has implemented.

Henderson's Proven Track Record of Excellence

The facts speak clearly to Director Henderson's effective leadership. Under his direction, the DPA's audit team has received multiple awards for their work, and he has successfully resolved longstanding operational challenges, including persistent difficulties meeting police misconduct investigation deadlines that had plagued the Department for years. These are measurable improvements that directly serve the public interest and enhance police accountability in our city.

Director Henderson has also been a strong advocate for the Department's mission, publicly fighting for adequate funding and resources. His testimony before the Board of Supervisors Budget Committee demonstrated his commitment to maintaining comprehensive oversight capabilities, even as the Department has lost approximately 40% of its authorized positions since 2021 due to citywide budget constraints entirely beyond his control.

It is true that many employees at DPA work very hard. We wear multiple hats. Most of us gladly jump in to help our colleagues when they need more help. The consistent underfunding of DPA and the immense stress that came with this budget cycle cannot be attributed to Director Henderson.

Personal Attacks Disguised as Professional Concerns

The recent complaints appear to be personal grievances rather than legitimate management concerns. Several key facts support this assessment:

1. **Minority Opposition**: As noted in recent reporting, these complaints come from only four employees out of approximately 40 staff members. Other DPA attorneys, including Tinnetta Thompson, have publicly defended Henderson, calling the accusations “unfair,” “disingenuous,” and describing them as "bullying tactics" designed to discredit his accomplishments. The survey conducted in 2024 contained very personal insults directed at Director Henderson and at least two other members of management, rather than constructive criticism of any system or process at DPA.

2. **Budget Decisions Were Mandated**: The layoffs that critics cite were the result of citywide budget cuts, not Director Henderson’s personal choices. He advocated against these cuts and warned of their impact on the Department’s oversight capabilities.

3. **Timing of Complaints**: The escalation of complaints coincided with necessary organizational changes and accountability measures, suggesting resistance to reform rather than legitimate workplace concerns. In particular, the idea that any staff was “threatened” over deadlines is simply disingenuous. At a time when too many cases had passed the 270-day mark, management emphasized the need to complete our investigations in a timely manner. **Section 4.136(d)** of the San Francisco City Charter states, “DPA shall use its best efforts to conclude investigations of such complaints and, if sustained, transmit the sustained complaint to the Police Department within nine months of receipt thereof by DPA.” Director Henderson places the responsibility for ensuring that the Government Code section 3304 statute of limitations squarely on his attorneys and no one else..

4. **External Validation**: Significantly, even representatives from the police union have spoken in support of DPA staff members, indicating that under Director Henderson’s leadership, DPA staff have maintained professional relationships across traditional adversarial lines.

The Challenge of Leading Organizational Change

Effective leadership often requires making difficult decisions that may be unpopular with some staff members. The resistance Director Henderson faces appears to reflect the natural tension that arises when longstanding practices are reformed and accountability is strengthened. It is not uncommon in any organization for some individuals to resist increased expectations and oversight, particularly when they have grown comfortable with previous arrangements.

As you well know, transforming any organization—especially one tasked with police accountability—requires steady leadership and the willingness to address performance issues and maintain professional standards. Internal accountability, such as timekeeping, sick leave abuses, quality control measures and timely delivery of efficient work has increased under Director Henderson. Some individuals may find this environment challenging and prefer previous management approaches that may have been less demanding.

The Danger of Rewarding Workplace Disruption

Allowing a small group of disaffected employees to undermine effective leadership through public campaigns sets a dangerous precedent. If employees believe they can circumvent proper channels and use media pressure to remove leaders who hold them accountable, that will make it impossible to maintain professional standards or implement necessary reforms in any city department.

Recommendation

I urge you to maintain your confidence in Director Paul Henderson's leadership and reject attempts to undermine his authority through personal attacks. The DPA serves a critical function in maintaining public trust in our police department, and this mission requires strong, consistent leadership focused on results rather than accommodating those who resist accountability.

Director Henderson has demonstrated his commitment to the Department's mission through concrete achievements and professional advocacy. The City would be poorly served by allowing workplace politics and personal grievances to override documented performance and dedication to public service.

Thank you for your consideration of these important matters.

Respectfully,

Rowena Abad
Management Assistant
Rowena.Abad@sfgov.org

Jeanetta Minix
Investigator
Jeanetta.Minix@sfgov.org

Natalie Sabrina Garcia
Public Service Aide/Intern Coordinator
Natalie.s.garcia@sfgov.org

Cori Varsallone
Investigator
Cori.Varsallone@sfgov.org

Helen Calderon
Investigator
Helen.Calderon@sfgov.org

Stephanie Wargo-Wilson
Senior Trial Attorney/Director of Training
Stephanie.wargo-wilson@sfgov.org

Tinnetta Thompson
Senior Trial Attorney/Director of Recruitment & Racial Equity
Tinnetta.Thompson@sfgov.org

Mary Ann McCormick
Executive Assistant
Maryann.mccormick@sfgov.org

Sharis Yau
Senior budget analyst
Sharis.yau@sfgov.org

Sandra Wilkerson
Legal Assistant
Sandra.wilkerson@sfgov.org

Gwen Lancaster
Senior Clerk
Gwen.Lancaster@sfgov.org

****Additional DPA employees indicated that though they wholeheartedly agreed with the sentiments in this letter, they felt uncomfortable signing their names to it for fear of retaliation from other DPA staff.*

Item 82

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: Horrific driving in SF, no law
Date:	Thursday, August 21, 2025 8:21:15 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding traffic enforcement.

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: Girish Gupta <girish@girishgupta.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 8:12 AM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Horrific driving in SF, no law

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

Looping in supervisors.

Dear all,

Could you please let me know to whom I should address concerns about the lack of civilized driving and enforcement in San Francisco, please? I've tried all the proper channels—attending meetings, calling 911, emailing the Mayor, etc. Given that all of these have yielded absolutely nothing, could you please explain what I should do next?

Thanks,

Girish

On Thu, 14 Aug 2025 at 17:35, Girish Gupta <girish@girishgupta.com> wrote:

> Another guy nearly ran into me with my daughter just now. Smirking prick in a BMW. Given zero help from the police, mayor's office, or any other government body for years, I'm going to have to deal with this myself. I've tried contacting you all. I've gone to meetings at SFMTA. And my family seems in more danger than ever.
>
> Girish
>
> On Thu, Aug 14, 2025 at 11:55 Girish Gupta <girish@girishgupta.com> wrote:
>
> > Stroller hit by a car this morning. Driver drove off. What's your plan? You understand I'm paying tax here, right?
> >
> > On Fri, Aug 8, 2025 at 08:35 Girish Gupta <girish@girishgupta.com> wrote:
> >
> > > Following up. I'll be attending an event with the mayor soon and if I don't hear back will be confronting him publicly about this. Not responding is not acceptable.
> > >
> > > On Wed, Aug 6, 2025 at 06:04 Girish Gupta <girish@girishgupta.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > > Hi,
> > > >
> > > > Do you not consider this important? Divisadero has become unwalkable. You cross the road and cars are coming at you from both sides—when you have right of way.
> > > >
> > > > If this doesn't change, and the police and local government continues to ignore

the problem, you are going to see many more deaths and injuries, all of which could have been prevented by a little competence from those in power.

I look forward to your response.

Girish

On Tue, Aug 5, 2025 at 09:11 Girish Gupta <girish@girishgupta.com> wrote:

> Following up here.
>
> On Fri, 1 Aug 2025 at 10:27, Girish Gupta <girish@girishgupta.com> wrote:
> >
> > Hi,
> >
> > I commend the speed cameras but could you please explain what is being
> > done about unenforced rules against reckless driving (going through
> > red lights, mowing down pedestrians on crosswalks, etc) and road rules
> > that favor multi-ton vehicles over pedestrians (right on red)?
> >
> > Around a dozen times since I moved to San Francisco, I've had a car
> > nearly hit me. Once it hit my daughter's stroller. Another time it was
> > a foot away from my two-year-old daughter. Last week, it was a foot
> > away from my two-year-old daughter and her pregnant-with-twins mother.
> >
> > I've called the police each time, and each time they do nothing. The
> > vehicles have, on multiple occasions, been close enough for me to
> > strike them. Is that the solution? Can you please explain what to do
> > next time someone comes close to killing me or my family? And what do
> > I do if and when they do kill a member of my family? Will the police
> > do anything then or will this just be a statistic at which you all
> > express faux sorrow?
> >
> > I look forward to some action and to a response. The way in which the
> > road system is designed to work, let alone how people use it, in San
> > Francisco is horrifying.
> >
> > Best,

>
> Girish

Item 83

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: MEDIA ALERT - SF taxi drivers demand debt relief NOW
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 9:42:32 AM
Attachments:	SFTWA Press Release 8-26-2025.pdf Taxi Drivers Declaration.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication regarding taxi medallion debt relief.

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: Evelyn Engel <evelynengel@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 9:30 PM
To: SFTWA (San Francisco Taxi Workers Alliance) <board@sftwa.org>
Subject: MEDIA ALERT - SF taxi drivers demand debt relief NOW

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

Cab drivers who purchased San Francisco taxi medallions for $250,000 and now are weighed down by enormous debt with no end in sight will hold a rally Wednesday, August 27, to demand debt relief and a

fix to San Francisco's broken taxi medallion system.

Please see the attached press release for details and the supplemental taxi drivers' declaration for the reasons why we take this action.

Respectfully,
Evelyn Engel
San Francisco Taxi Workers Alliance

Taxi Drivers Declaration –
Give us back our Lives, Liberty and Chance for Happiness

WHEN in the Course of human Events, it becomes necessary for working People to revolt under the Tyranny of Debt, a decent Respect to the Opinions of Mankind requires that they should declare the Causes which impel them to this Action.

We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men and Women are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness—-That when financial Bondage becomes destructive of these Ends, it is the Right of working People to demand Relief from the Tyranny of Debt, to alter or to abolish it, and to demand new Foundations, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety, Dignity, and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Debt should not be abolished for light and transient Causes. But when a long Train of Abuses invariably reduce them under an absolute Despotism of Debt, it is their Right, it is their Duty, to demand Relief and new Guards for their future Security. Such has been the patient Sufferance of these Taxi Drivers; and such is now the Necessity which constrains them to demand Medallion Debt Relief now.

The History of the present Lender is a History of repeated Injuries, not all having the direct Object of Tyranny but all resulting in the Establishment of an absolute Tyranny of Debt over Taxi Drivers. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid World.

The Credit Union collaborated with SFMTA to offer us Loans that carried great Risks to Borrowers, structured like the subprime Loans that caused the recent Great Recession, in order to help SFMTA sell more Medallions:

By partnering with SFMTA to reduce down-payment Requirements for Taxi Drivers to as little as 5%;

By offering Taxi Drivers short-term Balloon Loans that had to be paid in full or refinanced every few Years;

By compelling Taxi Drivers to refinance at whatever terms they offered, because few Drivers could pay the whole Balance;

By offering many such Loans with long amortization Periods and low monthly Payments that were in Essence interest-only Loans.

The Credit Union deliberately put Taxi Drivers into these risky Balloon Loans for years after Taxi Business suffered Declines upon the Entry of Uber and Lyft, who did not have to pay $250,000 to operate each For-Hire Vehicle.

The Credit Union granted only two Months of loan Forbearance when Covid-19 struck, knowing full well that Taxi Business, already decimated by Uber and Lyft, plummeted even more.

The Credit Union demanded that Taxi Drivers resume monthly loan Payments in June 2020 while the Covid-19 Pandemic raged.

The Credit Union rejected SFMTA's offer of $15 Million to cover Drivers' monthly loan Payments during the Covid-19 Crises.

The Credit Union then mercilessly foreclosed on 99 Medallion Loans between June 2020 and January 2021 and greedily added Losses from these Foreclosures to the Damages it hoped to recover through its Lawsuit against the City.

In every stage of these Oppressions we have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble Terms to the Government. Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by Silence. Now, forty per cent of all Medallion Loans have been foreclosed, and Taxi Drivers who have not yet defaulted struggle mightily to repay their Loans. We are crushed under the Tyranny of Debt, suffering physical Pain and mental Anguish from long Hours at Work, with little Time to spend with our Families, or attend to our own Health, and the Amount we owe has barely diminished.

We must, therefore, acquiesce in the Necessity to appeal, at long last, directly to the Lender. We remind them of our Circumstances. We appeal to their native Justice and Magnanimity, and we conjure them by the Ties of our common Humanity to disavow these Injuries, and give us Medallion Debt Relief now. Give us back our Lives, Liberty and Chance for Happiness.

By and in Behalf of Taxi Medallion Purchasers
San Francisco Taxi Workers Alliance

San Francisco Taxi Workers Alliance

Media Alert
August 26, 2025
For immediate release

Media Contacts:
Mark Gruberg - 415-606-1106 - mark1106@att.net
Barry Taranto - 415-271-6512 - barryto@pacbell.net
Evelyn Engel - 415-265-7814 - evelynengel@sbcglobal.net

Re: Taxi caravan to San Francisco Federal Credit Union to protest medallion debt
When: Wednesday, August 27, gathering at Civic Center (Grove St.) at 1:00 p.m.
To: SFFCU at 770 Golden Gate Avenue (at Gough) at 1:30 p.m.

Taxi Drivers Demand Debt Relief Now

Cab drivers who purchased San Francisco taxi medallions for $250,000 and now are weighed down by enormous debt with no end in sight will hold a rally Wednesday, August 27, to demand debt relief and a fix to San Francisco's broken taxi medallion system.

The rally will kick off with a taxi caravan beginning at 1 p.m. at Grove and Polk streets and will proceed to the San Francisco Federal Credit Union at Golden Gate and Gough streets. The SFFCU holds most taxi medallion loans. A press conference will be held at the credit union shortly after 1:30 p.m. while taxi drivers circle the block in their cabs.

More than 300 of the approximately 725 medallions sold between 2010 and 2016 have been lost to foreclosure after these medallion owners defaulted on their monthly loan payments. The introduction of the major ride-hailing apps -- Lyft and Uber -- into the driver-for-hire service industry, combined with the impacts of the pandemic, shut the door on the medallion sales program and reduced taxis' market share at the airport and in downtown San Francisco.

Meanwhile, Mayor Daniel Lurie has opened the door for Waymo autonomous vehicles, as well as Uber Black and Lyft Black, to operate on car-free Market Street, further encroaching on medallion owners' ability to cover their monthly loan payments.

Because SFMTA rules set $250,000 as a fixed price for medallions, none have been sold since 2016. Medallion owners are essentially prisoners of their loans. In 2018, the credit union unsuccessfully sued the SFMTA over the medallion sales program. The case concluded in January 2024 when the California Supreme Court refused to hear the credit union's last appeal. Since then, the credit union and SFMTA have been talking, but without apparent result.

"In the year and a half since the credit union lost its case, nothing has been done to fix the system or provide the relief we so desperately need," said medallion owner Matt Sutter. "We want a seat at the table and debt relief now."

"It's time for SFFCU to live up to its mission to 'provide innovative solutions that bring peace of mind and financial stability,' said Evelyn Engel of the SF Taxi Workers Alliance. "Medallion owners—SFFCU customers—have neither. They are drowning in debt, while SFFCU is a thriving, $1.3 billion financial institution, the second fastest growing credit union in the Bay Area."

####

The San Francisco Taxi Workers Alliance is a non-profit union fighting to improve the working conditions and protect the rights of San Francisco's taxi drivers.

Item 84

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: Proposal for Improved Shared Scooter Parking Compliance in San Francisco
Date:	Wednesday, August 13, 2025 1:31:02 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding the shared scooter program.

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: SF Vintage <treasurehunter@sanfranciscovintage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 12:04 PM
To: Munowitch, Monica (MTA) <Monica.Munowitch@sfmta.com>; Wise, Viktoriya (MTA) <Viktoriya.A.Wise@sfmta.com>; Nhan, Leanne (MTA) <Leanne.Nhan@sfmta.com>; Graff, Ted (MTA) <Ted.Graff@sfmta.com>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Harmon, Virginia (MTA) <Virginia.Harmon@sfmta.com>; McAuliff, Erin (MTA) <Erin.McAuliff@sfmta.com>; HSA DAS, (HSA) (DSS) <das@sfgov.org>
Subject: Proposal for Improved Shared Scooter Parking Compliance in San Francisco

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

Hello,

I am reaching out regarding an ongoing and highly visible issue with San Francisco's shared scooter program: improper parking and the lack of enforcement of existing permit requirements.

According to SFMTA's own program materials, permitted scooter companies are required to provide user education and clear parking instructions as part of their operations. Yet in practice, scooters are still frequently left blocking sidewalks, ADA ramps, and building entrances, despite over 11,000 shared bike racks available across the city. This creates accessibility barriers, damages public perception of the program, and increases complaints to both operators and the City.

It appears the education components outlined in the permit framework (as outlined here in 2018) have not been consistently implemented or enforced. Given that the technology and policy tools already exist, the fix could be deployed quickly.

Proposed Solution
Require all permitted scooter operators to:

- Provide concise, **visual onboarding** within their apps to show proper parking locations and practices, replacing text-heavy guidelines.
- **Integrate GPS-based parking verification** so rides can only be ended at approved parking locations, such as shared bike racks.
- Update user agreements so riders must accept these policies before using the service.
- **Pass improper parking fines directly to the user**, incentivizing compliance and reducing operator repositioning costs.

Benefits

- **Improved Accessibility:** Keeps ADA ramps and sidewalks clear.
- **Reduced Complaints:** Builds public trust and decreases the risk of restrictions or bans.
- **Low-Cost Implementation:** Uses existing operator technology.
- **Policy Consistency:** Creates a uniform standard across all operators.

Implementation Recommendation
Integrate these requirements into the next Shared Scooter Permit renewal cycle, with a 90-day pilot involving one operator to measure the reduction in improper parking incidents. Use pilot data to support citywide adoption.

Call to Action
I have attached examples, research from other cities, and a proposed implementation timeline. With strong coordination between SFMTA and scooter companies, this could be one of the fastest and most visible improvements to San Francisco's shared mobility program.

Scooter_Parking_and_Policy_Packet.pptx

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to your response.

---

photo

Krystyl (She/Her)
San Francisco Vintage
Shop Sustainably www.sfvintagemaps.com
Web www.sanfranciscovintage.com
Instagram @san.franciscovintage
By APPT Only

Item 85

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: Serious Concerns | Geary Blvd. Construction Project
Date:	Wednesday, August 27, 2025 9:39:02 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding construction projects on Geary Boulevard.

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: Padric McCaig <padricmccaig@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 8:27 PM
To: commission@sfwater.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; GearyUpgrades@sfwater.org
Subject: Serious Concerns | Geary Blvd. Construction Project

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

Hi,

I'm a resident whose apartment is located on Geary Blvd. between 17th and 18th Avenues and witnessing the construction project in progress. I have some serious concerns about the impact of this project on residents, not just businesses, on Geary Blvd. I also have very serious concerns about the quality of the work that is being done on this project due to issues that have crept up over the weeks of living with this construction. I understand the necessity of this project, I'm all for it and support it 100%.

However, I have experienced various issues first hand which cause me pause on the quality of the work being put into this project. These are a lack of checks and balances and oversight of the actual construction work being done. I have contacted 311 five times and submitted requests for steel plates to be repaired and I'd be surprised if other tenants and residents aren't doing the same. These steel plates, as they are being driven over by buses, trucks and heavy vehicles result in loud noises and excessive vibrations of the building I live in, so much so that I'm being woken up in the dead of night, while having a white noise machine on, which never happened prior to this project commencing. I am having objects on my walls starting to move in ways that an earthquake would cause. I have concerns that this is causing foundation issues along the corridor that will eventually lead to lawsuits filed by building owners and property management companies.

I had received one call back after threatening to put in a request to stop this project so that all the various parts of it can be reviewed and it can move forward in a safe manner for all the stakeholders, including residents...this was my third attempt at getting some action and with words of frustration that resulted in the content of the request being attended to; previous requests went unanswered. The official who called me back informed me that the welds on the temporary steel plates in the initial complaint had been broken and that the contractor would re-weld them the next day. Sure enough, this happened and everything was fine...until a few days ago with another set of steel plates directly in front of the apartment building I live in on the north side of Geary Blvd. between 17th and 18th Avenues broke apart and continues to cause the issue that I have indicated earlier and I'm on day three of this issue. I submitted two complaints via the 311 app and they have gone unresponded to. I noticed this morning that the welds were also broken on the steel plates and seeing this, my concerns are raised about the quality of the construction that is taking place. If welds are breaking on steel plates on the surface, what are welds on the buried water and sewer pipes and the electric conduit all along the length of this project going to like in the event of an earthquake or just in the everyday roadway vibrations once the project is completed? Is this a sign of a failure to come? How can we as citizens, district residents, be reassured that this project will provide what it's supposed to do, to ensure continuity of utility services in the event of a

natural disaster that *will* happen at some point, not *if*.

I am concerned that if these issues are surfacing this early in the second phase of this project with just standard steel plates, how can we know that these aren't issues with the contractors' quality of work?

I know that the goal is always to be as safe and cause the least negative impact on businesses and residents as possible; however, I am deeply concerned that issues and details are being ignored or they are not going to surface until these underground utilities fail way before the end of their anticipated lifespans.

Who are the leaders that ensure quality control of all the steps that are taking place on a daily basis? Who inspects the day's work? Who are the individuals accountable when failures such as steel plates are happening and who will know what will happen to the infrastructure once it is completely buried and out of sight? At this point, given my experience with the lack of attention to these details and the failures of welding joints on these steel plates, there will be additional issues that won't be known until after an earthquake or disaster.

This is a huge financial commitment by the government and with what seems like no oversight over the project details like these, the city is at risk of lawsuits and additional project costs when it comes to repairs and impact on private buildings. I would like to request that the project be paused and all parts of the project that have been done to date be reviewed for compliance with standard welding, underground utility construction and equipment placement to ensure that these issues that are already surfacing don't reflect overall poor construction quality issues and result in utility placement failures that will impact us in the Richmond District.

I respectfully ask that you please consider taking these steps so you can instill a sense of confidence in Geary Blvd. residents and businesses that this project will move forward with the high level of attention to details and quality construction that currently seem to be lacking. I would hope that with our precious and limited public funding dollars that require exceptional stewardship, that stronger oversight be taken to ensure a successful project and confidence of work quality for local stakeholders.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Padric J. McCaig

Geary Blvd. Resident

Item 86

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: SF City Guides tours
Date:	Friday, August 22, 2025 12:14:39 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding City Guides.

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.*

-----Original Message-----
From: Maya Keshavan <maya@obnoid.com>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 12:07 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: SF City Guides tours

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

Hello,

I've been a San Francisco resident for over 35 years now and I just went on my first City Guides tour. This is an amazing resource. I was so impressed with the tour guides and the tour itself. I signed up for the stairway tours next.

This organization is affiliated with the San Francisco Public Library.

Donations are a primary source of funding. I think the city should send some funding their way so they don't have to rely on donations. It's an invaluable resource for locals and tourists alike.

Thank you for your time

Maya Keshavan

Item 87

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: Urgent Need for Transparency and Accountability in Criminal Justice Data Systems
Date:	Thursday, August 21, 2025 1:41:17 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding the Justice Information Tracking System (JUSTIS).

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: Tom <tom_adlfinger@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 1:31 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Urgent Need for Transparency and Accountability in Criminal Justice Data Systems

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

Dear Mayor Lurie,

I’m writing to express deep concern regarding the status of the JUSTIS criminal justice data integration program and the broader issue of recidivism tracking in San Francisco.

As you know, the JUSTIS 5-Year Roadmap was launched in 2019 with the goal of modernizing and connecting data systems across our city’s justice agencies. That roadmap should have concluded early last year. Yet, to date, as far as I know, there has been no public accounting of its outcomes, no integrated dashboard, and no meaningful progress in tracking recidivism rates—despite repeated commitments from city leadership.

The lack of transparency is troubling. Recidivism is a critical metric for evaluating the effectiveness of our justice system, reentry programs, and public safety initiatives. Without it, we are flying blind. While I appreciate the city’s efforts to track broader social outcomes like housing and employment, these cannot replace the need for clear, consistent data on reoffense rates.

I urge your office to:

- Publicly disclose the current status of the JUSTIS roadmap and its deliverables
- Identify which agencies have failed to integrate their systems and why
- Commit to publishing recidivism data in a transparent, accessible format
- Appoint a single accountable leader to oversee justice data integration moving forward

San Francisco deserves a justice system that is not only compassionate and rehabilitative—but also measurable and accountable. I hope you will make this a priority in your administration.

Sincerely,

Thomas L. Adlfinger

Mount Davidson Manor Neighborhood

Tom_adlfinger@yahoo.com