

FILE NO. 251033

Petitions and Communications received from October 2, 2025, through October 16, 2025, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on October 21, 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 nominations to the following body. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

- Appointment pursuant to Charter, Section 4.133, to the Homelessness Oversight Commission:
 - Obai Rambo - term Ending May 1, 2027
 - Dontaye Ball - term ending May 1, 2029

From Supervisor Shaman Walton, regarding recommendations by the Commission Streamlining Task Force to alter the Youth Commission. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From various departments, pursuant to Ordinance No. 10-25, submitting Administrative Code, Chapter 21B, waiver notifications. 7 Waivers. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

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 September 2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), submitting the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT) October 9, 2025, meeting minutes and the October 23, 2025 meeting agenda. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the Office of the Mayor (MYR), submitting the State Legislation Committee's October 15, 2025, meeting agenda; approval of positions on legislation before the California State Legislature. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the Arts Commission (ART), submitting the agenda for the October 6, 2025 meeting of the Full Commission, the draft minutes for the September 30, 2025 meeting and the agenda for the October 15, 2025 meeting of the Visual Arts Committee, the agenda for the October 20, 2025 meeting of the Civic Design Review Committee, and the cancellation notice for the October 22, 2025 meeting of the Executive Committee. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From the Office of the Controller (CON), regarding General Obligation Bonds, Series 2025F, under the 2024 Healthy, Safe, and Vibrant San Francisco General Obligation Bond Program. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From the San Francisco Public Library (SFPL), regarding a seminar on Manga as Art. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner, submitting the Accidental Overdose Report for October 2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 21.43, submitting the Quarter 1 (July 1, 2025 – September 30, 2025) Report on Delegated Authority Contracts. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From the California Fish and Game Commission, regarding notice of receipt of 19 separate petitions to list various plants as threatened or endangered species under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From Yuba County Water Agency, submitting a petition for temporary change involving water transfers to reauthorize and extend the existing Yuba Accord Water Transfer Program through December 31, 2026. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From San Francisco Vintage, regarding vintage shops in San Francisco. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From Death Penalty Focus, regarding the Resolution urging Governor Gavin Newsom to use his executive powers to commute the death sentences for all individuals currently sentenced to death in California. File No. 250935, Resolution No. 436-25. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Telegraph Hill Dwellers, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) eliminate the North Beach Special Use District and consolidate certain controls into the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, 2) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District, 3) expand allowable uses in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District, 4) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Nob Hill Special Use District, and 5) reduce limitations on Restaurants and Bars in the Jackson Square Special Use District. File No. 250682. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan; the proposed Ordinance amending the Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan; and amending the General Plan to revise the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park

Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, to implement the Family Housing Zoning Program. File Nos. 250700, 250701, and 250966. 41 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From members of the public, regarding the 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, Resolution No. 437-25. 10 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Resolution urging the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) to develop and implement a comprehensive enforcement and intervention plan to address drug use or suspected drug activity especially within 250 feet of parks, playgrounds, and schools, including issuing citations, conducting assessments, and removing individuals for processing or detoxification services. File No. 250991. 23 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From Unite Here!, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Planning Code to create the 530 Sansome Mixed-Use Tower and Fire Station Special Use District; the proposed Ordinance approving a Development Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco and EQX Jackson SQ Holdco LLC for the development of a project on certain real property known as 425 Washington Street, 439-445 Washington Street, 530 Sansome Street, and 447 Battery Street, and generally bounded by Sansome Street to the west, Washington Street to the north, Battery Street to the east, and Merchant Street to the south; and the proposed Ordinance approving a Hotel and Fire Station Development Incentive Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco and EQX Jackson SQ Holdco LLC for the 530 Sansome Mixed Use Tower and Fire Station 13 Development Project. File Nos. 250697, 250698, and 250803. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From members of the public, regarding sex workers in the Mission. 7 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From members of the public, regarding John F. Kennedy Drive. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From members of the public, regarding the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) efforts to install parking meters on residential streets. 36 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From members of the public, regarding Great Highway/Sunset Dunes. 39 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From members of the public and various organizations, regarding the Vaillancourt Fountain in Embarcadero Plaza (formerly Justin Herman Plaza). 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From Legal Services for Prisoners with Children, and Legal Aid at Work, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to 1) create a procurement legislative analysis authority for the City Administrator; 2) revise or create threshold dollar amounts for application of various contract requirements tied to the statutory Minimum Competitive Amount or statutory federal Single Audit Standard; 3) reorganize, standardize, and narrow Chapter 12F (relating to the MacBride Principles concerning Northern Ireland; including sunset of ordinance in 2036); 4) repeal Chapter 12J (relating to City business with Burma); and 5) narrow coverage of, and reduce meeting requirements in, Chapter 12L (relating to certain non-profit organizations receiving funds from the City); and amending the Labor and Employment Code to 6) reorganize, standardize, revise exemptions and waivers narrowing coverage, create threshold dollar amount for application tied to the statutorily based Minimum Competitive Amount, and update Article 131 (relating to nondiscrimination under City contracts; including sunset of ordinance in 2036) and repeal Article 132 (relating to nondiscrimination under City property contracts), while incorporating some of its provisions under Article 131; 7) reorganize, standardize, revise exemptions and waivers narrowing coverage, create a threshold dollar amount for application tied to the statutorily based Minimum Competitive Amount and update Article 151 (relating to City procurement of sweatfree goods); 8) repeal Article 141 (relating to salary history in the hiring process of City contractors), Article 142 (relating to criminal history in the hiring and employment process of City contractors), and Article 161 (relating to earned income credit forms for employees of City contractors). File No. 250192. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From Secure Justice, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to delete the provision authorizing a court to award costs and attorney's fees to a plaintiff who is a prevailing party in an action alleging a violation Administrative Code, Chapter 19B, governing the acquisition of Surveillance Technology. File No. 250980. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From Julien DeFrance, regarding various subjects. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From Kitti Gidofalvy, 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. Copy: Each Supervisor. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From James Scott Patterson, regarding various subjects. Copy: Each Supervisor. (30)

From Lea McGeever, regarding various subjects. Copy: Each Supervisor. (31)

From Prodan Statev, regarding a proposed bike lane on Illinois Street. Copy: Each Supervisor. (32)

From a member of the public, regarding crime. Copy: Each Supervisor. (33)

From the Language Access Network of San Francisco, regarding the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) police chief hiring process. Copy: Each Supervisor. (34)

From members of the public, regarding California State Senate Bill 63, SB63 (Wiener, Arreguín), relating to transportation funding. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (35)

From KQED, regarding the Resolution supporting National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 51 KQED union workers and the reinvestment in local programming. File No. 250726, Resolution No. 316-25. Copy: Each Supervisor. (36)

From Carlton Fleming, regarding the appointment of a District 4 Supervisor. Copy: Each Supervisor. (37)

From the San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations regarding the Small Business Commission. (38)

From Cody Smith, regarding traffic control systems. Copy: Each Supervisor. (39)

From a member of the public, regarding bike lanes on Valencia Street. Copy: Each Supervisor. (40)

From a member of the public, regarding their experiences while operating a taxi at San Francisco International Airport (SFO). 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (41)

From a member of the public and the West of Twin Peaks Central Council regarding a Resolution expressing interest in forming an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) to support funding Affordable Housing in Well-Resourced Neighborhoods and requesting the Controller's Office, Office of Economic Workforce Development, and Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to explore options for establishing an EIFD and other innovative financing options. File No. 250790. Resolution No. 456-25. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (42)

From a member of the public, regarding scooter rental companies. Copy: Each Supervisor. (43)

From Boyd Richard, regarding digital coupons at supermarkets. Copy: Each Supervisor. (44)

From Mark Steven Chan, regarding the Police Department. Copy: Each Supervisor. (45)

From Michael Nulty, regarding unpermitted tree removals at United Nations Plaza. Copy: Each Supervisor. (46)

From Henrik Gehrmann, regarding traffic surveillance systems. Copy: Each Supervisor. (47)

From Ted Scott-Smith, regarding trash cans on Taraval Street. Copy: Each Supervisor. (48)

From Peter Sherman, regarding cell phone use on Muni vehicles. Copy: Each Supervisor. (49)

From San Franciscans for an Independent Women's Commission, regarding the Commission on the Status of Women. Copy: Each Supervisor. (50)

From Alliance for a Better District 6, regarding the Disability and Aging Services Commission, and the Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Council. (51)

From Young Palmer, regarding employee wellness. Copy: Each Supervisor. (52)

From San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations, regarding Ordinance amending the Planning Code to require conditional use authorization prior to replacing a Legacy Business with a new non-residential use in certain Neighborhood Commercial, Named Neighborhood Commercial, and Neighborhood Commercial Transit Districts, and in the Chinatown Mixed Use Districts; 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 adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302. File No. 250808. Copy: Each Supervisor. (53)

From Latrice McNealy, regarding the In-Home Supportive Services provider orientation process. Copy: Each Supervisor. (54)

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: October 16, 2025
 To: Members, Board of Supervisors
 From:  Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
 Subject: Mayoral Nominations - Homelessness Oversight Commission

On October 10, 2025, the Office of the Mayor submitted the following nomination packages. These nominations shall be subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors at a public hearing and vote within 60 days (December 9, 2025).

Nominations to the Homelessness Oversight Commission pursuant to Charter, Section 4.133:

- **Obai Rambo** - term ending May 1, 2027
- **Dontaye Ball** - term ending May 1, 2029

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

Pursuant to Board Rule 2.18.1, the Clerk of the Board shall refer these motions to the Rules Committee and work with the Rules Committee Chair to schedule these nominations for hearings.

- 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



Notice of Nomination

October 10, 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 4.133, Article IV of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco, I hereby nominate Obai Rambo for appointment to the Homelessness Oversight Commission, Seat 2, designated for a person with significant experience providing services to or engaging in advocacy on behalf of persons experiencing homelessness, for the unexpired portion of a term ending May 1, 2027 (replacing Jonathan Butler, resigned).

I also nominate Dontaye Ball for appointment to the Homelessness Oversight Commission, Seat 4, designated for a person who has participated in a merchants' or small business association, for a term ending May 1, 2029 (replacing Dena Aslanian-Williams, term expired).

I am confident that both nominees will serve the community with integrity, dedication, and a deep understanding of the challenges facing San Francisco. Attached are their qualifications, which reflect their experience and their ability to represent the City's diverse neighborhoods, communities of interest, and populations.

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Lurie", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

Item 2

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Supervisor Walton's Letter Opposing Most Recommendations to Alter the Youth Commission
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 3:35:33 PM
Attachments: [Sup Walton Letter Opposing Youth Commission Alterations.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached from the Office of District 10, regarding the Commission Streamlining Task Force.

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: Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 3:29 PM
To: commissionstreamlining <commissionstreamlining@sfgov.org>
Cc: Youthcom, (BOS) <youthcom@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Esquivel Garcia, Alondra (BOS) <Alondra.Esquivel@sfgov.org>; Zhan, Joy (BOS) <joy.zhan@sfgov.org>; Ochoa, Joshua (BOS) <joshua.rudy.ochoa@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Supervisor Walton's Letter Opposing Most Recommendations to Alter the Youth Commission

Dear Members of the Commission Streamlining Task Force,

Please see Supervisor Walton's letter opposing most of the recommendations to alter the Youth Commission.

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

October 15, 2025

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

RE: Opposing Most Recommendations to Alter the Youth Commission

Dear Members of the Commission Streamlining Task Force,

I am writing to express my opposition to the recommendations to alter or weaken the San Francisco Youth Commission. The Youth Commission is a vital and voter-mandated body that ensures young people have a formal voice in shaping the policies and budget priorities of our City. Undermining its structure would not only silence youth representation but also disregard the will of the voters who created it.

The Youth Commission has long served as a pathway for civic engagement and leadership development. My Chief of Staff, Natalie Gee, is a former Youth Commissioner, and it was through that experience that she became exposed to and engaged with City government, ultimately dedicating her career to community and public service. Our office has also had former interns who served as Youth Commissioners, and we always encourage young people in District 10 to apply and serve on the Commission. The Youth Commission has inspired and prepared countless young San Franciscans to lead with knowledge, compassion, and purpose.

Recommendation: Reduce from 17 to 15 seats (Both Mayoral Seats)

I strongly disagree with this recommendation. Removing a Mayoral seat, particularly one that represents underrepresented communities, would reduce opportunities for diverse youth voices to inform the Board of Supervisors on key issues. The Mayor's general seats also ensure that citywide perspectives are included in youth policy discussions. Every Youth Commission seat plays a role in ensuring equitable and inclusive representation and provides an opportunity for young people to learn and engage with city government.

Recommendation: Add 2-Term Limit

I believe a two-term limit is unnecessary, as the existing age limit already functions as a natural term limit. Most Youth Commissioners serve only a few years before aging out of eligibility or go into higher education between the ages 15-24. Imposing an additional term limit would diminish institutional knowledge and result in a less experienced Commission, ultimately

weakening youth engagement in government.

Recommendation: Move from Charter to Administrative Code

I strongly oppose this recommendation. The Youth Commission was established in the City Charter by a vote of the people in 1995. Moving it into the Administrative Code would undermine the democratic process by allowing future administrations or elected officials to alter or dissolve the Commission without voter approval. The Charter defines the structure of our government and the duties of its bodies, while the Administrative Code governs regulatory procedures. The Youth Commission's placement in the Charter reflects its essential role in our City's structure and should remain there.

Recommendation: Add 3-Year Sunset

I strongly oppose adding a sunset clause. The Youth Commission is a permanent institution that has demonstrated its value for decades. Placing an expiration date on the Commission would jeopardize a critical avenue for civic engagement and place it at risk of dissolution based on political changes. Other cities across the nation have modeled their own Youth Commissions after our very own Youth Commission.

Recommendation: Remove Prohibition on Stipends

I support this recommendation. Youth Commissioners dedicate significant time and energy to civic service, and stipends would increase accessibility for those who cannot afford to volunteer. Most, if not all Chartered Commissions other than the Youth Commission already receive a stipend.

At a time when civic participation and youth engagement are more important than ever, the City should be strengthening, not weakening, institutions that uplift young people's voices. The Youth Commission has been a cornerstone of inclusive governance in San Francisco and a model for how we cultivate future leaders from all communities.

For these reasons, I urge the Task Force to reject the proposed reductions and structural changes and to uphold the integrity of the San Francisco Youth Commission as established by the voters.

Thank you for your consideration,



Supervisor Shamann Walton
San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 10

Item 3

From: [Schneider, Dylan \(HOM\)](#)
To: [Bonde, Aly \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [OCA \(ADM\)](#); [Yuan, Jane \(CON\)](#); [Macaulay, Devin \(CON\)](#); [Modi, Kunal \(MYR\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Pan, Eufern \(MYR\)](#); [Kaushal, Jessica \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HOM\)](#); [Velasquez, Edilyn \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); [Whitley, Gigi \(HOM\)](#); [Gil, Hailey \(HOM\)](#)
Subject: 21B Waiver Notification - Contract - Simtech Solutions
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 3:17:33 PM
Attachments: [Simtech Solutions - PIT Count - 21B Justification .docx.pdf](#)
[Outlook-DHSH_symbo.png](#)

Good afternoon 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 contract with Simtech Solutions for planning, coordination and implementation of San Francisco's federally mandated bi-annual point in time count in 2026 and 2028.

The administration of the bi-annual PIT count provides critical data to inform homeless services and is part of the City's 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](https://twitter.com/SF_HSH) | Like: [@SanFranciscoHSH](https://facebook.com/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.



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*: Contract

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#: 1000036745

Anticipated Contract/PO Amount: \$200,000

Anticipated Contract/PO Start Date: 10/13/2025

Anticipated Contract/PO End Date: 10/12/2028

Supplier ID: 0000050991

Supplier Name: Simtech Solutions, Inc.

Provide details about the anticipated agreement*:

Include the provider's name, services to be provided, number served, site name and address when appropriate and population to be provided. For new agreements, include any unique provider experience and/or qualifications that demonstrate the provider's ability to expand services to meet the Core Initiative, and any procurement information, as applicable.

To gather insights from interested agencies with relevant experience, the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) issued Request for Information (RFI) #153 for PIT Count Services. Simtech Solutions, Inc. was selected as a result of this streamlined RFI process. This new contract with Simtech Solutions, Inc. will provide planning, coordination, and implementation of the City and County of San Francisco's Point-in-Time (PIT) Homeless Counts held in January 2026.

Selection Justification:

Simtech offers a comprehensive and statistically rigorous methodology that includes project planning with community partners, usage of a dedicated GPS-enabled mobile app (Counting Us) developed in partnership with HUD TA providers and field-tested in over 430 counts, and a structured plan for real-time data collection and oversight. Their approach outlines the integration of shelter, unsheltered, vehicle, and youth data through a cohesive enumeration model and estimation procedures developed with an academic expert. Simtech also details that data will be cleaned, validated, and synthesized into HUD-compliant reporting, with transparent documentation of business rules and data models.

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 _____":

440 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

628.652.7700
sf.gov/HSH

- ☒ **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:

The **contract** for **Point-in-Time Count** is a project addressing homelessness.

For new agreements – Provide information about the new program, how it creates/adds capacity to the homelessness response system and who it will serve.

On a biennial basis, HSH works in conjunction with the San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board to conduct a comprehensive homeless street and shelter count known as the Point-in-Time (PIT) Homeless Count. This count is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Each count must be conducted during the last week of January, and in a manner prescribed by HUD. All count methods should be demonstrative of the best practices recommended by HUD to maximize the San Francisco score in the Continuum of Care (CoC) Competition, and other competitive federal processes. Each count will include a Unique Youth Count. Services and tasks shall be provided for the implementation of both the general Point-in-Time Count and the Unique Youth Count. The target population for the PIT Count includes the entire homeless population currently residing in San Francisco.

Signature

Shireen McSpadden

Department Head or Designee Name

Signature

DocuSigned by:

CAD7B781896B449...

9/26/2025
 Select date
 Date

From: [Schneider, Dylan \(HOM\)](#)
To: [Bonde, Aly \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [OCA \(ADM\)](#); [Yuan, Jane \(CON\)](#); [Macaulay, Devin \(CON\)](#); [Modi, Kunal \(MYR\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Pan, Eufern \(MYR\)](#); [Kaushal, Jessica \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HOM\)](#); [Whitley, Gigi \(HOM\)](#); [Velasquez, Edilyn \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); [Gil, Hailey \(HOM\)](#)
Subject: 21B Waiver Notification - Contract - Abode Services
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 3:20:49 PM
Attachments: [Abode - Adult RV RRH - 21 B Justification.docx.pdf](#)
[Outlook-DHSH_symbo.png](#)

Good afternoon 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 Abode Services to provide rapid rehousing services to at least 60 adult households.

The administration of rapid rehousing subsidies for 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](https://twitter.com/SF_HSH) | Like: [@SanFranciscoHSH](https://www.facebook.com/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.



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*: Contract

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#: 1000036646

Anticipated Contract/PO Amount: \$6,241,484

Anticipated Contract/PO Start Date: 11/1/2025

Anticipated Contract/PO End Date: 6/30/2028

Supplier ID: 000040774

Supplier Name: Abode Services

Provide details about the anticipated agreement*:

This new agreement with Abode Services for the provision of Rapid Re-housing (RRH) will provide services to at least 60 single adult households who are currently living in recreational vehicles (RVs). The grant aims to offer time-limited, as-needed RRH services to households referred through the strategy for addressing vehicular homelessness and residing in recreational vehicles. The primary objective is to empower households to assume full financial responsibility for their monthly rent and maintain housing stability through a combination of financial support and wrap-around services. The program operates on a non-turnover model, meaning that once a household exits the program, the slot is not refilled. This approach results in a gradual reduction in the number of households served over time, ultimately leading to program closure when all subsidies are fully utilized.

Abode Services has been administering RRH services to adults since 2021 as part of the Shelter-in-Place (SIP) rehousing and demobilization and since 2023 to single adults experiencing homelessness referred through Coordinated Entry. Referrals are anticipated to begin four to six weeks following the agreement execution.

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."

440 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

628.652.7700
sf.gov/HSB

- ☐ **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:

The agreement for **Adult Recreational Vehicle Rapid Re-housing (Adult RV RRH)** is a project addressing homelessness.

This agreement directly advances the Core Initiative to prevent and resolve homelessness through rapid re-housing and is a component of Mayor Lurie’s strategy for addressing vehicular homelessness. Households living in RVs face unique challenges in securing housing, including limited landlord acceptance and the need for coordinated move-in support. By dedicating capacity to this population and pairing time-limited rental assistance with supportive services, the program increases placements from RVs into permanent housing and promotes long-term stability. Through referrals made under the City’s vehicular homelessness strategy, the program ensures that individuals currently residing in RVs are connected with both permanent housing opportunities and the support needed to sustain them.

Signature

Shireen McSpadden
Department Head or Designee Name

Signature

DocuSigned by:
Shireen McSpadden
CAD7B781896B449

9/29/2025
Select date
Date

From: [Schneider, Dylan \(HOM\)](#)
To: [Bonde, Aly \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [OCA \(ADM\)](#); [Yuan, Jane \(CON\)](#); [Macaulay, Devin \(CON\)](#); [Modi, Kunal \(MYR\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Pan, Eufern \(MYR\)](#); [Kaushal, Jessica \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HOM\)](#); [Whitley, Gigi \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); [Velasquez, Edilyn \(HOM\)](#); [Gil, Hailey \(HOM\)](#)
Subject: 21B Waiver Notification - Contract - Catholic Charities
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 3:24:08 PM
Attachments: [CCCYO - RV RRH - Chapter 21B justification - 10.25-6.29 - DRAFT.docx.pdf](#)
[Outlook-DHSH_symbol.png](#)

Good afternoon 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 Catholic Charities to provide rapid rehousing services to up to 65 eligible family households, including families exiting vehicular homelessness.

The administration of rapid rehousing subsidies for families 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](https://twitter.com/SF_HSH) | Like: [@SanFranciscoHSH](https://facebook.com/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.



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#: 1000036645

Anticipated Contract/PO Amount: \$9,569,299

Anticipated Contract/PO Start Date: 11/1/2025

Anticipated Contract/PO End Date: 6/30/2029

Supplier ID: 0000023239

Supplier Name: Catholic Charities

Provide details about the anticipated agreement*:

This new agreement with Catholic Charities will provide rapid re-housing services to 65 families who are currently living in recreational vehicles (RVs).

Catholic Charities will provide up to 65 eligible family households with housing location, housing coordination, landlord liaison, subsidy administration, and housing-focused case management services. Grantee shall serve formerly homeless or at-risk of homelessness and income-eligible family households with an adult and at least one natural, adoptive and/or foster child below the age of 18. This may include a pregnant person, with or without a partner. Prioritization will be given to people experiencing homelessness, including people living in their vehicles. Catholic Charities brings extensive experience in providing family households with housing services, having operated rapid re-housing programs serving family households since 2018.

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."

440 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

628.652.7700
sf.gov/HSB

☐ **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 agreement directly advances the Core Initiative to prevent and resolve homelessness through rapid re-housing and is a component of Mayor Lurie’s strategy for addressing vehicular homelessness. Households living in RVs face unique challenges in securing housing, including limited landlord acceptance and the need for coordinated move-in support. By dedicating capacity to this population and pairing time-limited rental assistance with supportive services, the program increases placements from RVs into permanent housing and promotes long-term stability. Through referrals made under the City’s vehicular homelessness strategy, the program ensures that individuals currently residing in RVs are connected with both permanent housing opportunities and the support needed to sustain them.

Signature

Shireen McSpadden
Department Head or Designee Name

Signature

DocuSigned by:

Shireen McSpadden

CAD7B781896B449...

9/29/2025
Date

From: [Schneider, Dylan \(HOM\)](#)
To: [Bonde, Aly \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [OCA \(ADM\)](#); [Yuan, Jane \(CON\)](#); [Macaulay, Devin \(CON\)](#); [Modi, Kunal \(MYR\)](#); [Pan, Eufem \(MYR\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Kaushal, Jessica \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HOM\)](#); [Whitley, Gigi \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); [Velasquez, Edilyn \(HOM\)](#); [Gil, Hailey \(HOM\)](#)
Subject: 21B Waiver Notification - Contract - Catholic Charities
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 3:27:10 PM
Attachments: [CCCYO - Large Vehicle Outreach - Chapter 21B justification - 10.25-6.27 - DRAFT.docx.pdf](#)
[Outlook-DHSH_symbol.png](#)

Good afternoon 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 Catholic Charities to provide outreach and engagement to up to 501 households living in eligible large vehicles.

The administration of outreach and engagement services for eligible households exiting vehicular homelessness 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](https://twitter.com/SF_HSH) | Like: [@SanFranciscoHSH](https://www.facebook.com/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.



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#: 1000037025

Anticipated Contract/PO Amount: \$5,654,596

Anticipated Contract/PO Start Date: 11/1/2025

Anticipated Contract/PO End Date: 6/30/2027

Supplier ID: 0000023239

Supplier Name: Catholic Charities

Provide details about the anticipated agreement*:

The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing requests authorization to enter into a new grant with Catholic Charities. This grant is for new services. Catholic Charities will provide street-based homeless outreach engagement, housing-focused case management support services, large vehicle buyback program administration, flexible financial assistance, collaboration with City partners, and management of large vehicle refuge permits for people experiencing vehicular homelessness. The program is expected to serve up to 501 eligible vehicles. Catholic Charities outreach team members will provide services in areas of San Francisco where people are currently staying in their vehicles, as identified by City outreach teams.

Catholic Charities is experienced at providing outreach services, support services, and problem-solving services, including issuing payments to clients for flexible financial assistance. They will be subcontracting with Bayview Hunters Point Community Advocates, which has competency and experience working with people experiencing homelessness in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhoods, where a significant proportion of the large vehicles are located.

The program is expected to last approximately eighteen months (November 1, 2025 to April 30, 2027). The agreement term extends to June 30, 2027 to allow for potential extensions, if needed, or any wind-down services.

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 _____":

440 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

628.652.7700
sf.gov/HSB

- ☒ **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:

The **agreement** for **Large Vehicle Outreach Program** is a project addressing homelessness.

This new program will provide outreach and service connection to people who are experiencing homelessness and living in their vehicle. Catholic Charities will outreach to residents of up to 501 vehicles, offering targeted services to support this population in securing permanent housing.

Signature

Shireen McSpadden

Department Head or Designee Name

Signature

DocuSigned by:
Shireen McSpadden
CAD7B781896B449...

9/29/2025
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 \(MYR\)](#); [Kaushal, Jessica \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HOM\)](#); [Whitley, Gigi \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); [Velasquez, Edilyn \(HOM\)](#); [Gil, Hailey \(HOM\)](#)
Subject: 21B Waiver Notification - Contract - Felton Institute
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 3:30:23 PM
Attachments: [Felton - Adult UAV - 21B Justification .docx.pdf](#)
[Outlook-DHSH_symbo.png](#)

Good afternoon 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 Felton Institute to provide emergency short-term hotel stays for up to 50 adults exiting vehicular homelessness.

The administration of emergency shelter hotel vouchers 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](https://twitter.com/SF_HSH) | Like: [@SanFranciscoHSH](https://facebook.com/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.



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#: 1000036756

Anticipated Contract/PO Amount: \$3,395,000

Anticipated Contract/PO Start Date: 11/15/2025

Anticipated Contract/PO End Date: 11/14/2026

Supplier ID: 0000020256

Supplier Name: Felton Institute

Provide details about the anticipated agreement*:

This new agreement with Felton Institute will provide 50 emergency short-term hotel stays at any given time for the duration of the contract term, along with housing-focused case management services to support adults exiting vehicular homelessness. Referrals will be made into the program by Street Teams, which provide outreach to the people experiencing vehicular homelessness. Felton Institute was selected for the provision of these services following their response to Request for Information #152: Shelter Expansion. Felton Institute was selected for their strong record providing services in the Bayview Neighborhood, where a majority of the Adult UAV work will take place, and their ability to begin services quickly.

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."

440 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

628.652.7700
sf.gov/HSB

Describe why the contract or lease is necessary to support the Core Initiative(s) selected above:
New Agreement/Contract Amendment:

The **agreement** for **Adult Urgent Accommodation Vouchers** is a project addressing homelessness.

This new program will supplement the shelter inventory and provide temporary shelter in hotels with a capacity for 50 adults at any given time as they work toward permanent housing. The goals of the Adult Urgent Accommodation Vouchers program are to provide adults experiencing vehicular homelessness with a safe and supportive short-term hotel stay, link individuals to needed services to support their stabilization, develop an individualized housing service plan to support exiting vehicular homelessness as quickly as possible, and support transitioning to permanent housing.

This program aligns with the City’s Home by the Bay plan by supporting Goal 1: Decrease Homelessness, as it provides hotel vouchers for adults experiencing vehicular homelessness, and Goal 3: Increase Number of People Exiting Homelessness, as it supports adults experiencing vehicular homelessness in transitioning to permanent housing.

Signature

Shireen McSpadden

Department Head or Designee Name

Signature

DocuSigned by:
Shireen McSpadden
CAD7B781896B449...

9/11/2025
Select Date
Date

From: [Zhuo, Lisa \(DPW\)](#)
To: [Bonde, Aly \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [OCA \(ADM\)](#); [Macaulay, Devin \(CON\)](#); [Yuan, Jane \(CON\)](#)
Subject: Chapter 21B Core Initiatives Legislation - Mayor and BOS advance written justification
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 10:35:59 AM
Attachments: [21B Core Initiatives Legislation Mayor and BOS advance written justification PW \\$2.544 Signed.pdf](#)
[21B Core Initiatives Legislation Mayor and BOS advance written justification PW \\$17.808.35 signed.pdf](#)

Hi All,

Please find attached Chapter 21B Core Initiatives Legislation - Mayor and BOS advance written justification associated with the purchases for the 33 Gough Restore project.

Thank you,

Lisa Zhuo, Architect, LEED-AP

Project Manager & Facilities Renewal Program Manager

San Francisco Public Works | Project Delivery Division | Bureau of Project Management

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1100 | San Francisco, CA 94103 | (628) 271-2777 desk | (415) 519-9491 cell

| sfpublicworks.org | twitter.com/sfpublicworks



Carla Short, Director | Director's Office

carla.short@sfdpw.org | T. 628.271.3078 | 49 South Van Ness Ave. Suite 1600, San Francisco, CA 94103

Department & Agreement Information (*required)

Department Name*: Department of Public Works

Agreement Type*: Purchase Order (PO)

Department Contact Name*: Lisa Zhuo

Department Contact Phone #*: 628-271-2777

Department Contact Email*: lisa.zhuo@sfdpw.org

For Contracts, Requisitions, and Purchase Orders:

Contract/Req/PO PeopleSoft ID#: 0000976877

Anticipated Contract/PO Amount: \$2,544

Anticipated Contract/PO Start Date: 10/9/2025

Anticipated Contract/PO End Date: 11/8/2025

Supplier ID: 0000012282

Supplier Name: Resource Design Interiors

Provide details about the anticipated agreement*: Procure new furniture and equipment for a project located at 33 Gough Street.

For Leases:

New Lease or Amendment: Select here

City-as-tenant or City-as-landlord? Select here

Anticipated Lease Start Date: Select date

Anticipated Lease End Date: Select date

Contracting Party ID: Enter 10-digit ID

Contracting Party Name: Enter supplier name

Provide details about the anticipated lease*: Enter detailed description here

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 Mental Health Needs":


- ☐ **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 DPH Department intends to open a behavioral-health intensive program at 33 Gough, the program anticipates opening on 11/1/2025. The FF&E purchased per this agreement is needed to support the operation of the program at this location.

Signature

Carla Short

Department Head or Designee Name

DocuSigned by:

073CF73A4EA6486...
Signature

10/9/2025 | 5:19:41 PM PDT

Select date

Date



Carla Short, Director | Director's Office

carla.short@sfdpw.org | T. 628.271.3078 | 49 South Van Ness Ave. Suite 1600, San Francisco, CA 94103

Department & Agreement Information (*required)

Department Name*: Department of Public Works

Agreement Type*: Purchase Order (PO)

Department Contact Name*: Lisa Zhuo

Department Contact Phone #*: 628-271-2777

Department Contact Email*: lisa.zhuo@sfdpw.org

For Contracts, Requisitions, and Purchase Orders:

Contract/Req/PO PeopleSoft ID#: 0000976829

Anticipated Contract/PO Amount: \$17,808.35

Anticipated Contract/PO Start Date: 10/9/2025

Anticipated Contract/PO End Date: 11/8/2025

Supplier ID: 0000012282

Supplier Name: Resource Design Interiors

Provide details about the anticipated agreement*: Procure new furniture and equipment for a project located at 33 Gough Street.

For Leases:

New Lease or Amendment: Select here

City-as-tenant or City-as-landlord? Select here

Anticipated Lease Start Date: Select date

Anticipated Lease End Date: Select date

Contracting Party ID: Enter 10-digit ID

Contracting Party Name: Enter supplier name

Provide details about the anticipated lease*: Enter detailed description here

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 Mental Health Needs":

- ☐ **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."




Carla Short, Director | Director's Office
carla.short@sfdpw.org | T. 628.271.3078 | 49 South Van Ness Ave. Suite 1600, San Francisco, CA 94103

Describe why the contract or lease is necessary to support the Core Initiative(s) selected above:

The DPH Department intends to open a behavioral-health intensive program at 33 Gough, the program anticipates opening on 11/1/2025. The FF&E purchased per this agreement is needed to support the operation of the program at this location.

Signature

Carla Short
Department Head or Designee Name

DocuSigned by:

073CE73A4EA6486...
Signature

10/9/2025 | 4:52:37 PM PDT
Select date
Date

Item 4

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: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for September 2025
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 11:39:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for September 2025.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector, submitting the Pooled Investment Report for the month of September.

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: Dion, Ichieh (TTX) <ichieh.dion@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 8:18 AM
Subject: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for September 2025

All-

Please find the CCSF Pooled Investment Report for the month of September 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



Treasurer & Tax Collector

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

José Cisneros
TREASURER

Investment Report for the month of September 2025

October 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 Francisco
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 September 30, 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 September 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 *

(in \$ million)	Current Month		Prior Month	
	Fiscal YTD	September 2025	Fiscal YTD	August 2025
Average Daily Balance	\$ 17,118	\$ 17,007	\$ 17,172	\$ 17,122
Net Earnings	164.25	53.64	110.61	55.25
Earned Income Return	3.81%	3.84%	3.79%	3.80%

CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics *

(in \$ million)	% of Portfolio	Book Value	Market Value	Wtd. Avg. Coupon	Wtd. Avg. YTM	WAM
Investment Type						
U.S. Treasuries	22.14%	\$ 3,753.5	\$ 3,754.4	2.70%	3.04%	716
Federal Agencies	38.21%	6,463.1	6,479.9	3.74%	3.81%	707
Public Time Deposits	0.35%	60.0	60.0	4.32%	4.32%	73
Negotiable CDs	18.41%	3,120.0	3,122.6	4.31%	4.31%	156
Commercial Paper	9.00%	1,525.7	1,526.2	0.00%	4.31%	99
Medium Term Notes	1.03%	174.2	174.9	3.92%	4.18%	507
Money Market Funds	7.18%	1,216.9	1,216.9	4.09%	4.09%	1
Supranationals	1.54%	260.3	261.3	3.41%	3.82%	524
Secured Bank Deposit	2.14%	362.3	362.3	4.10%	4.10%	1
Totals	100.0%	\$ 16,936.1	\$ 16,958.6	3.31%	3.81%	480

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, Nancy Hom
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 September 30, 2025

<i>(in \$ million)</i>							
Security Type	Par Value	Book Value	Market Value	Market/Book Price	Current % Allocation	Max. Policy Allocation	Compliant?
U.S. Treasuries	\$ 3,762.0	\$ 3,753.5	\$ 3,754.4	100.02	22.16%	100%	Yes
Federal Agencies	6,467.2	6,463.1	6,479.9	100.26	38.16%	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	3,120.0	3,120.0	3,122.6	100.08	18.42%	30%	Yes
Bankers Acceptances	-	-	-	-	0.00%	40%	Yes
Commercial Paper	1,543.5	1,525.7	1,526.2	100.03	9.01%	25%	Yes
Medium Term Notes	174.6	174.2	174.9	100.40	1.03%	30%	Yes
Repurchase Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	10%	Yes
Reverse Repurchase/							
Securities Lending Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	\$75mm	Yes
Money Market Funds - Government	1,216.9	1,216.9	1,216.9	100.00	7.19%	20%	Yes
LAIF	-	-	-	-	0.00%	\$50mm	Yes
Supranationals	261.8	260.3	261.3	100.38	1.54%	30%	Yes
Secured Bank Deposit	362.3	362.3	362.3	100.00	2.14%	N/A	Yes
TOTAL	\$ 16,968.4	\$ 16,936.1	\$ 16,958.6	100.13	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 September 30, 2025

Average Daily Balance	\$17,006,513,262
Net Earnings	\$53,641,379
Earned Income Return	3.84%
Weighted Average Maturity	480 days



Investment Type	(\$ million)	Par Value	Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	\$	3,762.0	\$ 3,753.5	\$ 3,754.4
Federal Agencies		6,467.2	6,463.1	6,479.9
Public Time Deposits		60.0	60.0	60.0
Negotiable CDs		3,120.0	3,120.0	3,122.6
Commercial Paper		1,543.5	1,525.7	1,526.2
Medium Term Notes		174.6	174.2	174.9
Money Market Funds		1,216.9	1,216.9	1,216.9
Supranationals		261.8	260.3	261.3
Secured Bank Deposit		362.3	362.3	362.3
Total		\$ 16,968.4	\$ 16,936.1	\$ 16,958.6





Asset Allocation by Market Value

Portfolio Analysis

Pooled Fund



Yield Curves



Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

As of September 30, 2025

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity		Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized	
				Date					Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	912797QF7	U.S. Treasury Bill	9/4/2025	10/16/2025		0.00	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 99,511,167	\$ 99,825,417	\$ 99,823,920
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	U.S. Treasury Note	2/25/2021	10/31/2025		0.25	50,000,000	49,298,828	49,987,692	49,839,845
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	U.S. Treasury Note	3/2/2021	10/31/2025		0.25	50,000,000	49,078,125	49,983,770	49,839,845
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	U.S. Treasury Note	3/4/2021	10/31/2025		0.25	50,000,000	49,048,828	49,983,234	49,839,845
U.S. Treasuries	912797RP4	U.S. Treasury Bill	7/24/2025	11/18/2025		0.00	100,000,000	98,624,925	99,435,867	99,468,240
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	U.S. Treasury Note	2/25/2021	12/31/2025		0.38	50,000,000	49,455,078	49,971,984	49,554,690
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	U.S. Treasury Note	2/26/2021	12/31/2025		0.38	50,000,000	49,271,484	49,962,524	49,554,690
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	U.S. Treasury Note	6/28/2021	4/30/2026		0.75	50,000,000	49,662,109	49,959,652	49,130,860
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	U.S. Treasury Note	7/2/2021	4/30/2026		0.75	50,000,000	49,730,469	49,967,742	49,130,860
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	U.S. Treasury Note	7/23/2021	5/15/2026		1.63	50,000,000	52,203,125	50,283,384	49,343,750
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	U.S. Treasury Note	8/27/2021	5/15/2026		1.63	50,000,000	51,890,625	50,248,131	49,343,750
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/2/2021	6/30/2026		0.88	50,000,000	49,931,641	49,989,806	48,945,315
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/14/2021	6/30/2026		0.88	50,000,000	50,070,313	50,010,555	48,945,315
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/22/2021	6/30/2026		0.88	50,000,000	50,345,703	50,052,124	48,945,315
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/22/2021	6/30/2026		0.88	50,000,000	50,328,125	50,049,473	48,945,315
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	8/6/2021	6/30/2026		0.88	50,000,000	50,406,250	50,061,766	48,945,315
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	8/10/2021	6/30/2026		0.88	50,000,000	50,240,234	50,036,607	48,945,315
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	9/24/2021	6/30/2026		0.88	50,000,000	49,937,500	49,990,230	48,945,315
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	10/14/2021	6/30/2026		0.88	50,000,000	49,593,750	49,935,756	48,945,315
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	1/4/2022	6/30/2026		0.88	50,000,000	49,027,344	49,838,484	48,945,315
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	U.S. Treasury Note	9/28/2021	8/31/2026		0.75	50,000,000	49,449,219	49,897,686	48,673,830
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2021	9/30/2026		0.88	50,000,000	49,689,453	49,937,822	48,623,045
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2021	9/30/2026		0.88	50,000,000	49,671,875	49,934,303	48,623,045
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/19/2021	9/30/2026		0.88	50,000,000	49,318,359	49,862,691	48,623,045
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/3/2021	11/30/2026		1.25	50,000,000	50,072,266	50,016,847	48,615,235
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/7/2021	11/30/2026		1.25	50,000,000	50,117,188	50,027,380	48,615,235
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	3/29/2022	11/30/2026		1.25	50,000,000	47,078,125	49,272,527	48,615,235
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	U.S. Treasury Note	3/29/2022	12/31/2026		1.25	50,000,000	47,107,422	49,241,073	48,527,345
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	U.S. Treasury Note	4/6/2022	3/31/2027		2.50	25,000,000	24,757,813	24,927,344	24,582,033
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	6/26/2024	6/15/2027		4.63	50,000,000	50,199,219	50,114,312	50,785,950
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/9/2024	6/15/2027		4.63	50,000,000	50,292,969	50,170,146	50,785,950
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2024	6/15/2027		4.63	50,000,000	50,906,250	50,575,191	50,785,950
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/15/2025	6/15/2027		4.63	50,000,000	50,603,516	50,493,281	50,785,950
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/8/2025	6/15/2027		4.63	50,000,000	50,667,969	50,587,661	50,785,950
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/9/2025	6/15/2027		4.63	50,000,000	50,654,297	50,576,449	50,785,950
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/25/2025	6/15/2027		4.63	50,000,000	50,632,813	50,570,448	50,785,950
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	3/21/2024	6/30/2027		3.25	50,000,000	48,203,125	49,042,969	49,687,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	4/3/2024	6/30/2027		3.25	50,000,000	48,113,281	48,984,075	49,687,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	9/26/2024	6/30/2027		3.25	50,000,000	49,683,594	49,799,850	49,687,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	7/25/2025	6/30/2027		3.25	50,000,000	49,398,438	49,456,461	49,687,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLL3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/1/2024	9/15/2027		3.38	50,000,000	49,785,156	49,857,833	49,787,110
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	U.S. Treasury Note	2/12/2025	11/15/2027		4.13	61,000,000	60,692,617	60,763,199	61,643,361
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2024	12/15/2027		4.00	50,000,000	49,718,750	49,793,047	50,396,600
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2024	12/15/2027		4.00	50,000,000	49,712,891	49,788,736	50,396,600
U.S. Treasuries	9128284N7	U.S. Treasury Note	4/9/2024	5/15/2028		2.88	65,000,000	61,082,227	62,495,451	63,811,722
U.S. Treasuries	91282CND9	U.S. Treasury Note	5/15/2025	5/15/2028		3.75	70,000,000	69,485,938	69,551,133	70,248,829
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/5/2024	6/30/2028		4.00	50,000,000	49,974,609	49,984,453	50,507,815
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/18/2024	6/30/2028		4.00	50,000,000	49,927,734	49,955,395	50,507,815
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/18/2024	6/30/2028		4.00	50,000,000	49,904,297	49,940,929	50,507,815

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity		Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized	Market Value
				Date					Book Value	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	2/6/2024	6/30/2028		4.00	50,000,000	49,677,734	49,798,734	50,507,815
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	2/27/2024	6/30/2028		4.00	50,000,000	49,298,828	49,556,293	50,507,815
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2024	6/30/2028		4.00	50,000,000	48,939,453	49,295,077	50,507,815
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	U.S. Treasury Note	12/12/2023	8/31/2028		4.38	50,000,000	50,115,234	50,071,186	51,031,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/14/2025	8/31/2028		4.38	50,000,000	50,550,781	50,486,790	51,031,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2025	1/31/2029		4.00	60,000,000	59,927,344	59,934,882	60,672,654
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2024	1/31/2029		4.00	65,000,000	65,266,602	65,206,041	65,728,709
U.S. Treasuries	9128286B1	U.S. Treasury Note	4/11/2024	2/15/2029		2.63	50,000,000	45,710,938	47,013,883	48,373,045
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	U.S. Treasury Note	4/8/2024	2/28/2029		4.25	50,000,000	49,773,438	49,842,027	50,976,565
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2025	2/28/2029		4.25	75,000,000	75,568,359	75,510,581	76,464,848
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2024	4/30/2029		4.63	50,000,000	51,171,875	50,928,830	51,615,235
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	U.S. Treasury Note	12/20/2024	4/30/2029		4.63	51,000,000	51,448,242	51,367,998	52,647,540
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKT7	U.S. Treasury Note	10/23/2024	5/31/2029		4.50	50,000,000	51,039,063	50,827,047	51,425,780
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/1/2024	7/31/2029		4.00	50,000,000	51,046,875	50,830,260	50,541,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2024	7/31/2029		4.00	50,000,000	49,888,672	49,910,541	50,541,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/7/2024	7/31/2029		4.00	65,000,000	65,563,672	65,448,565	65,703,300
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	U.S. Treasury Note	10/1/2024	8/31/2029		3.13	50,000,000	49,041,016	49,236,018	48,994,140
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	U.S. Treasury Note	10/3/2024	8/31/2029		3.13	65,000,000	63,664,453	63,934,840	63,692,382
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	U.S. Treasury Note	5/30/2025	10/31/2029		4.00	60,000,000	59,988,281	59,989,181	60,700,782
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLR0	U.S. Treasury Note	11/25/2024	10/31/2029		4.13	50,000,000	49,611,328	49,678,229	50,816,405
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	U.S. Treasury Note	4/10/2025	2/28/2030		4.00	50,000,000	49,927,734	49,934,779	50,601,565
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	U.S. Treasury Note	5/22/2025	4/30/2030		3.88	50,000,000	49,468,750	49,507,622	50,341,795
Subtotals						2.70	\$ 3,762,000,000	\$ 3,741,245,702	\$ 3,753,502,294	\$ 3,754,358,183
Federal Agencies	3133EPDL6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/15/2023	10/1/2025		4.85	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,001,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2025		5.13	24,000,000	23,923,440	23,998,010	24,010,320
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2025		5.13	25,000,000	24,985,500	24,999,623	25,010,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2025		5.13	35,000,000	34,972,350	34,999,281	35,015,050
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2025		5.13	50,000,000	49,972,000	49,999,272	50,021,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2021	11/17/2025		1.05	39,675,000	39,622,232	39,673,302	39,518,284
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2021	11/17/2025		1.05	55,000,000	54,923,000	54,997,523	54,782,750
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/16/2021	12/16/2025		1.17	45,000,000	44,954,100	44,997,612	44,728,200
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/16/2021	12/16/2025		1.17	50,000,000	49,949,000	49,997,347	49,698,000
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/29/2022	12/29/2025		4.00	15,000,000	14,954,700	14,996,321	14,994,750
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/29/2022	12/29/2025		4.00	20,000,000	19,939,600	19,995,095	19,993,000
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/29/2022	12/29/2025		4.00	25,000,000	24,923,750	24,993,808	24,991,250
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/13/2023	1/13/2026		4.00	20,000,000	19,982,400	19,998,330	19,991,000
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/13/2023	1/13/2026		4.00	30,000,000	29,977,200	29,997,836	29,986,500
Federal Agencies	3130AUTC8	Federal Home Loan Bank	2/9/2023	2/6/2026		4.01	21,100,000	20,985,427	21,086,582	21,097,679
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/17/2023	2/17/2026		3.63	25,000,000	24,928,500	24,990,131	24,963,250
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/17/2023	2/17/2026		3.63	30,000,000	29,905,500	29,986,956	29,955,900
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	2/23/2026		4.38	25,000,000	24,953,500	24,993,848	25,035,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	2/23/2026		4.38	28,000,000	27,954,080	27,993,925	28,039,760
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	2/23/2026		4.38	50,000,000	49,918,000	49,989,151	50,071,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ35	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/25/2022	2/25/2026		3.32	35,000,000	34,957,650	34,995,136	34,899,550
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/2/2023	3/13/2026		4.88	10,000,000	9,953,900	9,991,283	10,045,100
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/2/2023	3/13/2026		4.88	10,000,000	9,950,700	9,990,678	10,045,100
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/2/2023	3/13/2026		4.88	10,000,000	9,950,700	9,990,678	10,045,100
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/5/2024	3/13/2026		4.88	25,000,000	25,053,750	25,012,392	25,112,750
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/2/2024	3/13/2026		4.88	36,730,000	36,803,460	36,746,865	36,895,652

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity		Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized	Market Value
				Date					Book Value	
Federal Agencies	3133EP5K7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/2/2024	3/13/2026		4.50	50,000,000	49,758,000	49,944,442	50,101,000
Federal Agencies	3133EMZ21	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/9/2021	4/6/2026		0.69	15,500,000	15,458,150	15,495,399	15,247,195
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/8/2022	4/8/2026		2.64	20,000,000	19,961,200	19,994,981	19,870,200
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/8/2022	4/8/2026		2.64	30,000,000	29,941,800	29,992,471	29,805,300
Federal Agencies	313385VP8	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	9/2/2025	4/15/2026		0.00	25,000,000	24,403,125	24,480,056	24,495,500
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/10/2023	6/12/2026		3.75	17,045,000	16,991,479	17,032,959	17,051,648
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/17/2023	6/12/2026		3.75	20,000,000	19,939,200	19,986,236	20,007,800
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/1/2023	6/12/2026		4.00	10,000,000	9,934,300	9,984,925	10,018,500
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/1/2023	6/12/2026		4.00	15,000,000	14,899,350	14,976,906	15,027,750
Federal Agencies	3130AWLZ1	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/10/2023	6/12/2026		4.75	50,000,000	49,856,000	49,965,753	50,343,000
Federal Agencies	3130B1BT3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/18/2024	6/12/2026		4.88	13,485,000	13,505,093	13,492,049	13,580,878
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/18/2024	6/12/2026		4.88	20,000,000	20,030,400	20,010,665	20,165,200
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/18/2024	6/12/2026		4.88	32,000,000	32,051,200	32,017,962	32,264,320
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026		4.25	20,000,000	19,969,200	19,992,778	20,073,400
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026		4.25	24,700,000	24,640,226	24,685,984	24,790,649
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026		4.25	30,000,000	29,951,400	29,988,604	30,110,100
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026		4.38	25,000,000	24,986,750	24,996,796	25,099,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026		4.38	25,000,000	24,986,750	24,996,796	25,099,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026		4.38	50,000,000	49,973,500	49,993,593	50,199,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026		4.75	10,000,000	9,991,700	9,997,752	10,081,900
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026		4.75	19,000,000	18,984,800	18,995,884	19,155,610
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026		4.75	21,000,000	20,982,780	20,995,337	21,171,990
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026		1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,479,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026		1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,479,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026		1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,479,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026		1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,460,750
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026		1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,460,750
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026		1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,460,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026		5.00	3,000,000	2,991,930	2,997,573	3,033,150
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026		5.00	9,615,000	9,589,136	9,607,220	9,721,246
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026		5.00	16,000,000	15,956,960	15,987,054	16,176,800
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026		5.00	25,000,000	24,936,750	24,980,975	25,276,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026		1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,435,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026		1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,435,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026		1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,435,250
Federal Agencies	3133EPSW6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/14/2023	8/14/2026		4.50	50,000,000	49,885,000	49,966,738	50,269,500
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026		1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,401,500
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026		1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,401,500
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026		1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,401,500
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026		3.63	19,000,000	18,974,730	18,988,154	18,978,150
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026		3.63	25,000,000	24,966,750	24,984,413	24,971,250
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026		3.63	25,900,000	25,865,553	25,883,851	25,870,215
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026		3.63	50,000,000	49,933,500	49,968,825	49,942,500
Federal Agencies	3133EM4X7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/12/2023	9/10/2026		0.80	28,975,000	26,174,277	28,014,433	28,194,414
Federal Agencies	3130AXCP1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/18/2023	9/11/2026		4.88	11,895,000	11,821,965	11,871,207	12,020,492
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026		4.00	15,000,000	14,996,850	14,998,386	15,050,100

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity		Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized	
				Date					Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026		4.00	25,000,000	24,994,750	24,997,310	25,083,500
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026		4.00	25,000,000	24,994,750	24,997,310	25,083,500
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026		4.00	50,000,000	49,989,500	49,994,620	50,167,000
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026		1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,407,750
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026		1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,407,750
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026		1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,407,750
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026		1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,407,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2026		4.88	14,000,000	13,904,940	13,966,694	14,160,020
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2026		4.88	30,000,000	29,834,100	29,941,874	30,342,900
Federal Agencies	3133ETJS7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/29/2025	11/10/2026		4.00	12,600,000	12,581,352	12,585,750	12,626,838
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026		1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,414,250
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026		1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,414,250
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026		1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,414,250
Federal Agencies	3130AXU63	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/17/2023	11/17/2026		4.63	50,000,000	49,911,500	49,966,732	50,540,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026		1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,387,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026		1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,387,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026		1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,387,500
Federal Agencies	3133ERWR8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/8/2024	1/7/2027		3.50	12,500,000	12,373,750	12,428,802	12,460,375
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027		4.13	12,000,000	11,973,000	11,988,247	12,073,800
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027		4.13	25,000,000	24,943,750	24,975,514	25,153,750
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027		4.13	29,350,000	29,283,963	29,321,254	29,530,503
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027		4.13	50,000,000	49,887,500	49,951,028	50,307,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027		4.13	5,000,000	4,992,850	4,996,862	5,023,650
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027		4.13	10,000,000	9,986,600	9,994,119	10,047,300
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027		4.13	25,000,000	24,968,500	24,986,176	25,118,250
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027		4.13	35,000,000	34,955,900	34,980,646	35,165,550
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027		4.13	50,000,000	49,933,000	49,970,596	50,236,500
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/18/2025	2/18/2027		4.25	2,000,000	1,997,860	1,998,520	2,013,240
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/18/2025	2/18/2027		4.25	25,000,000	24,974,250	24,982,187	25,165,500
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/18/2025	2/18/2027		4.25	30,000,000	29,967,600	29,977,586	30,198,600
Federal Agencies	3133ERD24	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/18/2024	2/18/2027		4.25	30,000,000	29,983,500	29,989,863	30,198,600
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027		3.75	15,000,000	14,980,050	14,981,504	15,009,300
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027		3.75	25,000,000	24,967,500	24,969,868	25,015,500
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027		3.75	35,000,000	34,950,650	34,954,246	35,021,700
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027		3.75	40,000,000	39,946,800	39,950,676	40,024,800
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/23/2025	2/23/2027		4.00	10,000,000	9,993,800	9,995,067	10,021,200
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/23/2025	2/23/2027		4.00	45,000,000	44,972,100	44,977,802	45,095,400
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027		2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,519,750
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027		2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,519,750
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027		2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,519,750
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027		2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,519,750
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/16/2022	3/10/2027		1.68	48,573,000	47,432,020	48,243,871	47,203,241
Federal Agencies	3133EP6K6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/2/2024	3/26/2027		4.50	50,000,000	49,910,000	49,955,248	50,571,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027		2.60	22,500,000	22,392,338	22,467,495	22,106,700
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027		2.60	24,500,000	24,377,010	24,462,867	24,071,740
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027		2.60	25,000,000	24,804,000	24,940,824	24,563,000
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027		4.75	17,000,000	16,955,120	16,977,211	17,269,620
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027		4.75	20,000,000	19,947,200	19,973,189	20,317,200

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized	Market Value
				Date				Book Value	
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	40,000,000	39,894,400	39,946,379	40,634,400
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	48,000,000	47,873,280	47,935,655	48,761,280
Federal Agencies	3133ERDS7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/13/2024	5/6/2027	4.75	12,727,000	12,740,236	12,734,080	12,930,887
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	4,650,000	4,646,792	4,648,841	4,680,225
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	5,000,000	4,996,550	4,998,754	5,032,500
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	21,000,000	20,987,001	20,995,305	21,136,500
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	25,000,000	24,982,750	24,993,770	25,162,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2023	5/20/2027	4.00	31,000,000	30,905,760	30,954,958	31,141,050
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2023	5/20/2027	4.00	58,850,000	58,662,269	58,760,274	59,117,768
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	10,000,000	9,986,700	9,988,729	10,037,800
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	13,000,000	12,982,710	12,985,348	13,049,140
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	16,500,000	16,478,055	16,481,403	16,562,370
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	20,000,000	19,973,400	19,977,458	20,075,600
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	36,000,000	35,952,120	35,959,425	36,136,080
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/19/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	10,000,000	10,141,500	10,048,908	9,956,300
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/19/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	12,375,000	12,552,829	12,436,464	12,320,921
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/20/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	21,725,000	22,016,550	21,825,827	21,630,062
Federal Agencies	3130AX4E5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/13/2024	6/11/2027	4.50	11,000,000	10,937,190	10,965,466	11,147,873
Federal Agencies	3130B1EF0	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/10/2024	6/11/2027	4.63	20,700,000	20,795,634	20,755,443	21,020,436
Federal Agencies	3133EPMV4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2027	4.13	28,940,000	28,911,928	28,928,049	29,135,056
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2022	6/28/2027	3.24	27,865,000	28,099,066	27,946,801	27,643,473
Federal Agencies	3133ERJZ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/28/2024	6/28/2027	4.50	30,000,000	29,985,840	29,991,788	30,394,200
Federal Agencies	3133ERV9R	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/30/2024	7/1/2027	3.50	55,000,000	54,925,200	54,952,468	54,800,900
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2024	7/8/2027	4.50	25,000,000	25,033,250	25,019,604	25,333,250
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/10/2024	7/8/2027	4.50	25,000,000	25,025,500	25,015,048	25,333,250
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/23/2024	7/23/2027	4.25	10,000,000	9,996,500	9,997,890	10,092,700
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/23/2024	7/23/2027	4.25	15,000,000	14,994,750	14,996,836	15,139,050
Federal Agencies	3133ETXS6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/11/2025	8/11/2027	3.63	5,000,000	4,989,950	4,990,652	4,991,650
Federal Agencies	3133ETXS6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/11/2025	8/11/2027	3.63	5,000,000	4,989,750	4,990,466	4,991,650
Federal Agencies	3133ETXS6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/11/2025	8/11/2027	3.63	7,000,000	6,985,930	6,986,913	6,988,310
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	8/23/2027	4.13	10,000,000	9,974,000	9,989,058	10,073,700
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/15/2024	10/15/2027	3.88	5,000,000	4,997,250	4,998,132	5,015,050
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/15/2024	10/15/2027	3.88	8,000,000	7,996,160	7,997,391	8,024,080
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ23	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/4/2025	11/3/2027	4.25	5,000,000	4,999,350	4,999,505	5,052,700
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ23	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/4/2025	11/3/2027	4.25	41,880,000	41,877,738	41,878,278	42,321,415
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/15/2023	11/15/2027	4.63	27,950,000	27,834,008	27,888,471	28,461,206
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/15/2023	11/15/2027	4.63	33,300,000	33,161,472	33,226,517	33,909,057
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	21,000,000	20,936,790	20,953,522	21,136,080
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	25,505,000	25,428,485	25,448,739	25,670,272
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	33,000,000	32,893,080	32,921,382	33,213,840
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	38,343,000	38,227,588	38,258,138	38,591,463
Federal Agencies	3133ERT84	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/14/2025	1/14/2028	4.25	29,750,000	29,575,963	29,617,286	30,037,385
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/31/2025	1/28/2028	4.25	47,000,000	46,976,030	46,981,364	47,561,650
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/31/2025	1/28/2028	4.25	50,000,000	49,974,500	49,980,174	50,597,500
Federal Agencies	3136GAAR0	Fannie Mae	2/14/2025	2/7/2028	4.69	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,977,250
Federal Agencies	3136GAAR0	Fannie Mae	2/14/2025	2/7/2028	4.69	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,977,250
Federal Agencies	3136GAAR0	Fannie Mae	2/14/2025	2/7/2028	4.69	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,977,250
Federal Agencies	3136GAAR0	Fannie Mae	2/14/2025	2/7/2028	4.69	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,977,250
Federal Agencies	3136GAAR0	Fannie Mae	2/14/2025	2/7/2028	4.69	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,954,500
Federal Agencies	3133EP5S0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2024	3/20/2028	4.25	4,971,000	4,916,667	4,937,028	5,032,889

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized	Market Value
				Date				Book Value	
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/11/2025	6/5/2028	3.88	7,370,000	7,342,584	7,345,401	7,403,018
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/5/2025	6/5/2028	3.88	25,000,000	24,957,250	24,961,853	25,112,000
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/7/2028	4.50	14,934,000	14,962,076	14,953,081	15,258,815
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/7/2024	6/7/2028	4.50	15,000,000	14,994,600	14,996,378	15,326,250
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/7/2028	4.50	20,000,000	20,037,600	20,025,553	20,435,000
Federal Agencies	3130AWC24	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/14/2025	6/9/2028	4.00	10,000,000	9,996,600	9,997,024	10,075,910
Federal Agencies	3130B6MU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/10/2025	6/15/2028	4.59	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,999,250
Federal Agencies	3130B6MU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/10/2025	6/15/2028	4.59	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,999,250
Federal Agencies	3130B6MU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/10/2025	6/15/2028	4.59	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,999,250
Federal Agencies	3130B6MU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/10/2025	6/15/2028	4.59	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,998,500
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2025	7/3/2028	3.75	22,500,000	22,424,175	22,430,147	22,551,300
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	7/3/2028	3.75	25,000,000	24,904,000	24,911,479	25,057,000
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2025	7/3/2028	3.75	50,000,000	49,829,500	49,842,928	50,114,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPSK2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/7/2023	8/7/2028	4.25	19,500,000	19,412,250	19,450,001	19,777,485
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	10,000,000	9,979,100	9,987,851	10,214,100
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	15,000,000	14,962,800	14,978,376	15,321,150
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	25,000,000	24,943,500	24,967,158	25,535,250
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	33,000,000	32,904,960	32,944,755	33,706,530
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/20/2024	10/20/2028	4.25	5,000,000	4,972,100	4,980,348	5,075,750
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/20/2024	10/20/2028	4.25	38,000,000	37,785,300	37,848,774	38,575,700
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/13/2023	11/13/2028	4.63	12,000,000	11,984,040	11,990,050	12,313,920
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/13/2023	11/13/2028	4.63	20,000,000	19,971,600	19,982,295	20,523,200
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/13/2023	11/13/2028	4.63	55,000,000	54,922,285	54,951,550	56,438,800
Federal Agencies	3130B3GD9	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/28/2024	11/27/2028	4.00	47,025,000	46,940,355	46,959,543	47,398,379
Federal Agencies	3130AVBD3	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/9/2024	3/9/2029	4.50	25,000,000	25,018,750	25,013,109	25,590,750
Federal Agencies	3133EP5U5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/8/2024	3/20/2029	4.13	51,660,000	51,008,309	51,203,420	52,541,836
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/8/2024	4/30/2029	4.75	27,892,000	28,191,755	28,107,501	28,864,036
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/8/2024	4/30/2029	4.75	30,000,000	30,317,400	30,228,186	31,045,500
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/8/2024	4/30/2029	4.75	63,085,000	63,763,795	63,573,000	65,283,512
Federal Agencies	3130B1BC0	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/31/2025	6/8/2029	4.63	9,705,000	9,943,355	9,932,859	10,007,505
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	10,000,000	9,967,600	9,975,865	10,183,940
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	10,000,000	9,967,600	9,975,865	10,183,940
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	10,000,000	9,967,600	9,975,865	10,183,940
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	20,000,000	19,935,200	19,951,731	20,367,880
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	29,000,000	28,923,730	28,943,187	29,533,426
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/2/2024	7/2/2029	4.01	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,829,250
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/2/2024	7/2/2029	4.01	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,829,250
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/2/2024	7/2/2029	4.01	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	64,556,050
Federal Agencies	3133ERKX8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/12/2024	7/12/2029	4.25	20,000,000	19,989,200	19,991,838	20,321,600
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/27/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	15,000,000	15,392,700	15,312,774	15,220,440
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/29/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	15,000,000	15,048,300	15,039,161	15,220,440
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/29/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	15,000,000	15,043,200	15,035,026	15,220,440
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/11/2025	9/14/2029	4.13	17,000,000	17,204,170	17,197,205	17,249,832
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/29/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	25,590,000	25,663,699	25,649,754	25,966,071
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/9/2025	10/9/2029	4.00	10,000,000	9,987,500	9,988,400	10,100,000
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/9/2025	10/9/2029	4.00	15,000,000	14,981,250	14,982,600	15,150,000
Federal Agencies	3136GAFL8	Fannie Mae	4/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.71	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,926,500
Federal Agencies	3136GAFL8	Fannie Mae	4/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.71	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,926,500
Federal Agencies	3136GAFL8	Fannie Mae	4/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.71	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,926,500
Federal Agencies	3136GAFL8	Fannie Mae	4/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.71	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,926,500

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity		Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized	
				Date					Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3136GAFL8	Fannie Mae	4/15/2025	10/15/2029		4.71	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,853,000
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/30/2025	11/30/2029		4.00	15,000,000	14,945,400	14,949,516	15,115,500
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/30/2025	11/30/2029		4.00	23,000,000	22,922,030	22,927,907	23,177,100
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/25/2025	1/18/2030		4.50	12,815,000	13,022,219	12,999,848	13,149,343
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/25/2025	1/18/2030		4.50	18,000,000	18,289,620	18,258,354	18,469,620
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	1/23/2030		4.00	5,000,000	4,989,550	4,990,174	5,050,400
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	1/23/2030		4.00	14,450,000	14,418,788	14,420,651	14,595,656
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	1/23/2030		4.00	25,000,000	24,946,000	24,949,224	25,252,000
Federal Agencies	3133ER7L9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/10/2025	3/18/2030		4.00	8,695,000	8,671,610	8,673,868	8,749,518
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2025	4/1/2030		4.00	15,000,000	14,993,700	14,994,306	15,137,400
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2025	4/1/2030		4.00	32,260,000	32,243,870	32,245,423	32,555,502
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/10/2025	4/1/2030		4.00	43,020,000	42,904,276	42,915,358	43,414,063
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2025	4/1/2030		4.00	46,750,000	46,732,703	46,734,368	47,178,230
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/15/2025	4/1/2030		4.00	50,000,000	49,527,500	49,571,569	50,458,000
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2025	6/10/2030		4.00	9,750,000	9,746,100	9,746,282	9,853,448
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/10/2025	6/10/2030		4.00	10,000,000	9,974,000	9,975,609	10,106,100
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2025	6/10/2030		4.00	15,000,000	14,998,650	14,998,713	15,159,150
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/10/2025	6/10/2030		4.00	20,000,000	19,945,000	19,948,404	20,212,200
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	6/10/2030		4.00	25,000,000	24,965,000	24,966,931	25,265,250
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/9/2025	6/14/2030		4.13	12,515,000	12,579,452	12,576,446	12,698,094
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/23/2025	6/14/2030		4.13	16,000,000	16,063,200	16,059,722	16,234,080
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	6/17/2030		4.00	10,070,000	10,077,855	10,077,485	10,163,681
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	6/17/2030		4.00	15,000,000	15,012,900	15,012,293	15,139,545
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2025	6/17/2030		4.00	16,944,000	16,937,222	16,937,538	17,101,630
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	6/17/2030		4.00	41,000,000	41,035,260	41,033,600	41,381,423
Federal Agencies	3133ETPF8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/14/2025	7/8/2030		3.75	20,000,000	19,776,200	19,785,914	20,038,400
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030		4.03	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,972,250
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030		4.03	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,972,250
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030		4.03	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,972,250
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030		4.03	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,944,500
Subtotals						3.74	\$ 6,467,204,000	\$ 6,457,218,105	\$ 6,463,135,082	\$ 6,479,872,222
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	PPGZ3O8Q4	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	06367DMX0	Bank of Montreal/CHI	11/19/2024	10/24/2025		4.57	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 50,009,500
Negotiable CDs	06367DPW9	Bank of Montreal/CHI	3/21/2025	10/24/2025		4.35	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,004,000
Negotiable CDs	13606DCE0	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	11/20/2024	10/24/2025		4.55	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,008,500
Negotiable CDs	89115DPK6	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	2/7/2025	10/24/2025		4.49	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,015,000
Negotiable CDs	89115DWK8	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/21/2025	11/5/2025		4.35	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,005,500
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	50,020,500
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	60,021,000
Negotiable CDs	96130AZR2	Westpac Banking Corp/NY	4/14/2025	12/3/2025		4.35	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,023,000
Negotiable CDs	13606DHE5	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	3/31/2025	12/15/2025		4.34	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,024,000
Negotiable CDs	89115DXB7	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/31/2025	12/15/2025		4.34	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,017,400
Negotiable CDs	89115DXF8	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/31/2025	12/29/2025		4.34	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,022,750
Negotiable CDs	06367DQK4	Bank of Montreal/CHI	5/7/2025	1/12/2026		4.32	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,020,500

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity		Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized	
				Date					Book Value	Market Value
Negotiable CDs	89115DQT6	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	2/13/2025	1/12/2026		4.54	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,097,000
Negotiable CDs	13606DKH4	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	5/6/2025	1/20/2026		4.33	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,024,000
Negotiable CDs	13606DGY2	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	3/25/2025	1/22/2026		4.36	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,045,600
Negotiable CDs	13606DGZ9	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	3/25/2025	1/28/2026		4.36	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,061,600
Negotiable CDs	89115DWT9	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/25/2025	1/28/2026		4.36	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,052,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DQ32	Bank of Montreal/CHI	3/31/2025	2/9/2026		4.33	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,072,750
Negotiable CDs	13606DHF2	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	3/31/2025	2/9/2026		4.33	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,022,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DQP3	Bank of Montreal/CHI	5/14/2025	2/11/2026		4.43	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,068,600
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	60,063,600
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	50,069,500
Negotiable CDs	89115DEG7	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	5/29/2025	3/11/2026		4.41	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,072,500
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	100,109,000
Negotiable CDs	89115DHC3	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	6/20/2025	3/16/2026		4.40	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,091,800
Negotiable CDs	96130AA24	Westpac Banking Corp/NY	5/20/2025	3/16/2026		4.35	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,095,000
Negotiable CDs	96130AA65	Westpac Banking Corp/NY	5/28/2025	3/23/2026		4.38	140,000,000	140,000,000	140,000,000	140,154,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DRH0	Bank of Montreal/CHI	6/25/2025	3/24/2026		4.33	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,059,500
Negotiable CDs	06367DRJ6	Bank of Montreal/CHI	6/25/2025	3/25/2026		4.33	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,060,500
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	50,077,000
Negotiable CDs	06418NEJ3	Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU	8/21/2025	4/20/2026		4.20	125,000,000	125,000,000	125,000,000	125,102,500
Negotiable CDs	06418NJK9	Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU	9/3/2025	4/23/2026		4.11	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,070,000
Negotiable CDs	78015JMC8	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	8/21/2025	4/23/2026		4.18	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,062,000
Negotiable CDs	96130AZZ4	Westpac Banking Corp/NY	5/15/2025	5/4/2026		4.35	125,000,000	125,000,000	125,000,000	125,182,500
Negotiable CDs	06367DRZ0	Bank of Montreal/CHI	8/5/2025	6/1/2026		4.17	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,107,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DSQ9	Bank of Montreal/CHI	9/9/2025	6/9/2026		4.00	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,012,880
Negotiable CDs	06367DS97	Bank of Montreal/CHI	8/18/2025	6/15/2026		4.20	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,143,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DSR7	Bank of Montreal/CHI	9/9/2025	6/15/2026		4.00	54,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000	54,017,280
Negotiable CDs	96130AC22	Westpac Banking Corp/NY	6/20/2025	6/15/2026		4.32	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,179,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DSV8	Bank of Montreal/CHI	9/24/2025	6/17/2026		3.98	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,001,100
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	100,213,000
Negotiable CDs	78015JL88	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	8/14/2025	7/1/2026		4.06	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,067,000
Subtotals						4.31	\$ 3,120,000,000	\$ 3,120,000,000	\$ 3,120,000,000	\$ 3,122,644,860
Commercial Paper	14912DX12	Caterpillar Financial Svcs	9/22/2025	10/1/2025		0.00	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 99,897,250	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 99,988,564
Commercial Paper	62479LX67	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/1/2025	10/6/2025		0.00	25,000,000	24,445,139	24,985,243	24,980,075
Commercial Paper	14912DX87	Caterpillar Financial Svcs	9/29/2025	10/8/2025		0.00	100,000,000	99,897,500	99,920,278	99,897,700
Commercial Paper	89233GX84	Toyota Motor Credit	1/27/2025	10/8/2025		0.00	60,000,000	58,179,667	59,949,833	59,938,620
Commercial Paper	62479LXF7	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/1/2025	10/15/2025		0.00	11,000,000	10,744,776	10,981,862	10,980,024
Commercial Paper	14912DXL8	Caterpillar Financial Svcs	9/29/2025	10/20/2025		0.00	30,450,000	30,377,174	30,384,110	30,376,981
Commercial Paper	62479LXL4	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/1/2025	10/20/2025		0.00	15,000,000	14,643,133	14,966,433	14,964,315
Commercial Paper	62479LXN0	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/1/2025	10/22/2025		0.00	55,000,000	53,678,533	54,863,967	54,856,780
Commercial Paper	89233GXP6	Toyota Motor Credit	2/12/2025	10/23/2025		0.00	75,000,000	72,665,021	74,796,958	74,794,425
Commercial Paper	89233GXQ4	Toyota Motor Credit	1/29/2025	10/24/2025		0.00	50,000,000	48,388,278	49,861,681	49,857,150
Commercial Paper	62479LXV2	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	8/22/2025	10/29/2025		0.00	15,000,000	14,878,450	14,949,950	14,949,165
Commercial Paper	62479LY33	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/28/2025	11/3/2025		0.00	10,000,000	9,772,150	9,960,217	9,960,420
Commercial Paper	62479LY74	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/28/2025	11/7/2025		0.00	11,000,000	10,744,650	10,951,047	10,951,457
Commercial Paper	62479LYH2	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/28/2025	11/17/2025		0.00	38,000,000	37,076,463	37,786,176	37,788,834
Commercial Paper	62479LYM1	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/28/2025	11/21/2025		0.00	26,000,000	25,355,655	25,841,248	25,843,610
Commercial Paper	62479LYS8	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/28/2025	11/26/2025		0.00	15,000,000	14,620,167	14,899,667	14,901,150
Commercial Paper	89233GZ17	Toyota Motor Credit	3/24/2025	12/1/2025		0.00	125,000,000	121,333,750	124,112,535	124,109,625
Commercial Paper	89116EZ55	Toronto Dominion Bank	5/7/2025	12/5/2025		0.00	11,000,000	10,724,694	10,915,590	10,916,345

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity		Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized	
				Date					Book Value	Market Value
Commercial Paper	89116EZF3	Toronto Dominion Bank	5/7/2025	12/15/2025		0.00	25,000,000	24,346,333	24,779,167	24,781,925
Commercial Paper	89233GZF6	Toyota Motor Credit	3/25/2025	12/15/2025		0.00	75,000,000	72,692,292	74,346,875	74,350,425
Commercial Paper	89116EZF1	Toronto Dominion Bank	5/7/2025	12/23/2025		0.00	40,000,000	38,924,111	39,611,744	39,615,400
Commercial Paper	62479MB69	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	5/13/2025	2/6/2026		0.00	25,000,000	24,198,604	24,618,667	24,637,925
Commercial Paper	62479MC92	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	6/18/2025	3/9/2026		0.00	130,000,000	125,891,133	127,525,342	127,682,230
Commercial Paper	62479MCQ4	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	7/7/2025	3/24/2026		0.00	100,000,000	96,930,556	97,945,833	98,061,100
Commercial Paper	62479MD67	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	7/28/2025	4/6/2026		0.00	110,000,000	106,712,100	107,560,169	107,715,190
Commercial Paper	62479MDN0	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	9/3/2025	4/22/2026		0.00	51,000,000	49,668,093	49,829,536	49,853,010
Commercial Paper	89233HEL4	Toyota Motor Credit	9/9/2025	5/20/2026		0.00	55,000,000	53,488,676	53,620,096	53,614,880
Commercial Paper	89233HEN0	Toyota Motor Credit	8/27/2025	5/22/2026		0.00	100,000,000	96,970,111	97,365,806	97,461,400
Commercial Paper	89233HF33	Toyota Motor Credit	9/9/2025	6/3/2026		0.00	60,000,000	58,264,500	58,407,500	58,404,540
Subtotals						0.00	\$ 1,543,450,000	\$ 1,505,508,958	\$ 1,525,737,529	\$ 1,526,233,265
Medium Term Notes	594918BJ2	Microsoft	9/26/2024	11/3/2025		3.13	\$ 11,749,000	\$ 11,650,191	\$ 11,740,909	\$ 11,734,784
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	Microsoft	7/9/2024	9/15/2026		3.40	6,452,000	6,270,957	6,372,822	6,426,257
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	Microsoft	7/9/2024	9/15/2026		3.40	13,009,000	12,645,919	12,850,209	12,957,094
Medium Term Notes	14913UAN0	Caterpillar	9/18/2024	10/16/2026		4.45	18,385,000	18,600,288	18,492,928	18,495,494
Medium Term Notes	89236TMY8	Toyota Motors	1/9/2025	1/8/2027		4.60	40,000,000	39,978,000	39,985,997	40,340,400
Medium Term Notes	037833CJ7	Apple	9/18/2024	2/9/2027		3.35	50,000,000	49,586,000	49,765,053	49,661,500
Medium Term Notes	24422EXV6	John Deere	9/6/2024	7/15/2027		4.20	10,000,000	9,998,600	9,999,124	10,062,700
Medium Term Notes	24422EYD5	John Deere	6/5/2025	6/5/2028		4.25	25,000,000	24,977,750	24,980,146	25,206,500
Subtotals						3.92	\$ 174,595,000	\$ 173,707,705	\$ 174,187,187	\$ 174,884,728
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	9/30/2025	10/1/2025		4.02	\$ 14,468,843	\$ 14,468,843	\$ 14,468,843	\$ 14,468,843
Money Market Funds	31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	9/30/2025	10/1/2025		4.09	835,215,136	835,215,136	835,215,136	835,215,136
Money Market Funds	608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations F	9/30/2025	10/1/2025		4.07	325,092,234	325,092,234	325,092,234	325,092,234
Money Market Funds	262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Manageme	9/30/2025	10/1/2025		4.06	15,052,480	15,052,480	15,052,480	15,052,480
Money Market Funds	85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MV	9/30/2025	10/1/2025		4.07	13,480,145	13,480,145	13,480,145	13,480,145
Money Market Funds	61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity F	9/30/2025	10/1/2025		4.05	13,636,922	13,636,922	13,636,922	13,636,922
Subtotals						4.09	\$ 1,216,945,761	\$ 1,216,945,761	\$ 1,216,945,761	\$ 1,216,945,761
Supranational	45950VRU2	International Finance Corp	1/26/2023	1/26/2026		4.02	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 99,911,000
Supranational	45818WDG8	Inter-American Development Bank	8/25/2021	2/27/2026		0.82	19,500,000	19,556,907	19,505,148	19,252,740
Supranational	459058KC6	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	9/12/2025	11/16/2026		2.25	55,000,000	54,035,300	54,077,926	53,975,900
Supranational	459058KJ1	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	7/17/2024	6/15/2027		3.13	12,323,000	11,934,333	12,095,577	12,201,618
Supranational	4581X0EN4	Inter-American Development Bank	4/9/2024	2/15/2029		4.13	25,000,000	24,630,000	24,742,690	25,314,750
Supranational	4581X0EN4	Inter-American Development Bank	7/17/2024	2/15/2029		4.13	50,000,000	49,827,000	49,872,575	50,629,500
Subtotals						3.41	\$ 261,823,000	\$ 259,983,540	\$ 260,293,917	\$ 261,285,508
Secured Bank Deposit	0660P0999	Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acc	9/30/2025	10/1/2025		4.10	\$ 362,344,940	\$ 362,344,940	\$ 362,344,940	\$ 362,344,940
Subtotals						4.10	\$ 362,344,940	\$ 362,344,940	\$ 362,344,940	\$ 362,344,940
Grand Totals						3.31	\$ 16,968,362,702	\$ 16,896,954,711	\$ 16,936,146,710	\$ 16,958,569,468

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

For month ended September 30, 2025

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accrued Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	912797QF7	B 0.000 10/16/2025	\$ 100,000,000		314,250		\$ 314,250
U.S. Treasuries	912797QM2	B 0.000 09/02/2025			11,639		11,639
U.S. Treasuries	912797RP4	B 0.000 11/18/2025	100,000,000		352,583		352,583
U.S. Treasuries	9128284N7	T 2.875 05/15/2028	65,000,000	152,344	78,512		230,856
U.S. Treasuries	9128286B1	T 2.625 02/15/2029	50,000,000	106,997	72,655		179,652
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	50,000,000	66,236	(37,617)		28,619
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	50,000,000	66,236	(32,938)		33,299
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	T 0.250 09/30/2025		9,904	16,122		26,027
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	T 0.250 09/30/2025		9,904	13,650		23,555
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	T 0.250 10/31/2025	50,000,000	10,190	12,308		22,499
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	T 0.250 10/31/2025	50,000,000	10,190	16,230		26,420
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	T 0.250 10/31/2025	50,000,000	10,190	16,766		26,956
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	T 0.375 12/31/2025	50,000,000	15,285	9,236		24,521
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	T 0.375 12/31/2025	50,000,000	15,285	12,355		27,640
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	T 0.750 04/30/2026	50,000,000	30,571	5,737		36,307
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	T 0.750 04/30/2026	50,000,000	30,571	4,586		35,157
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	1,124		36,790
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	(1,164)		34,502
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	(5,749)		29,917
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	(5,457)		30,209
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	(6,812)		28,853
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	(4,038)		31,628
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	1,078		36,743
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	7,086		42,752
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	17,814		53,480
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	T 0.750 08/31/2026	50,000,000	31,077	9,190		40,267
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	35,867	5,125		40,992
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	35,867	5,415		41,282
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	35,867	11,317		47,184
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	51,230	(1,189)		50,040
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	51,230	(1,933)		49,297
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	51,230	51,351		102,581
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	T 1.250 12/31/2026	50,000,000	50,951	49,929		100,881
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	T 2.500 03/31/2027	25,000,000	51,239	3,992		55,231
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	132,473	45,072		177,545
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	132,473	47,846		180,319
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	132,473	9,426		141,899
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	132,473	25,598		158,071
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	T 3.125 08/31/2029	50,000,000	129,489	16,028		145,517
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	T 3.125 08/31/2029	65,000,000	168,336	22,346		190,682
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFK2	T 3.500 09/15/2025		66,576	13,443		80,019
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFT3	T 4.000 10/31/2029	60,000,000	195,652	218		195,870
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	T 4.000 02/28/2030	50,000,000	165,746	1,215		166,960
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	163,043	465		163,509
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	163,043	1,334		164,378
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	163,043	1,767		164,810
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	163,043	6,020		169,063
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	163,043	13,271		176,315

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accrued Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	163,043	21,084		184,128
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	T 4.375 08/31/2028	50,000,000	181,285	(2,005)		179,279
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	T 4.375 08/31/2028	50,000,000	181,285	(13,712)		167,572
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	T 4.000 01/31/2029	60,000,000	195,652	1,604		197,256
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	T 4.000 01/31/2029	65,000,000	211,957	(5,075)		206,882
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	T 4.250 02/28/2029	50,000,000	176,105	3,804		179,908
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	T 4.250 02/28/2029	75,000,000	264,157	(12,293)		251,864
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	T 4.625 04/30/2029	50,000,000	188,519	(21,320)		167,199
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	T 4.625 04/30/2029	51,000,000	192,289	(8,447)		183,843
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKT7	T 4.500 05/31/2029	50,000,000	184,426	(18,544)		165,883
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	189,549	(5,513)		184,036
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	189,549	(8,206)		181,343
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	189,549	(27,742)		161,807
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	189,549	(23,792)		165,758
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	189,549	(28,344)		161,205
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	189,549	(27,803)		161,746
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	189,549	(27,514)		162,036
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	50,000,000	163,043	(17,804)		145,239
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	50,000,000	163,043	1,918		164,962
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	65,000,000	211,957	(9,619)		202,338
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLL3	T 3.375 09/15/2027	50,000,000	138,784	5,973		144,757
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLR0	T 4.125 10/31/2029	50,000,000	168,139	6,474		174,613
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	T 4.125 11/15/2027	61,000,000	205,129	9,166		214,296
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	50,000,000	163,934	7,713		171,647
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	50,000,000	163,934	7,873		171,808
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	T 3.875 04/30/2030	50,000,000	157,948	8,835		166,783
U.S. Treasuries	91282CND9	T 3.750 05/15/2028	70,000,000	213,995	14,071		228,066
Subtotals			\$ 3,762,000,000	\$ 8,335,832	\$ 1,037,984	\$ -	\$ 9,373,816
Federal Agencies	3130A8ZQ9	FHLB 1.750 09/12/2025		\$ 5,505	\$ (2,187)	\$	3,318
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	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	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	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396			22,396
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

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accrued Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
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	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	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	10,000,000	29,167	(2,374)		26,793
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	12,375,000	36,094	(2,984)		33,110
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	21,725,000	63,365	(4,895)		58,470
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	15,000,000	51,563	(6,498)		45,064
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	15,000,000	51,563	(814)		50,749
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	15,000,000	51,563	(728)		50,835
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	17,000,000	58,438	(4,097)		54,340
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	25,590,000	87,966	(1,241)		86,724
Federal Agencies	3130AUTC8	FHLB 4.010 02/06/2026	21,100,000	70,509	3,145		73,654
Federal Agencies	3130AVBD3	FHLB 4.500 03/09/2029	25,000,000	93,750	(313)		93,437
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	17,045,000	53,266	1,422		54,688
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	20,000,000	62,500	1,626		64,126
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	10,000,000	33,333	1,780		35,114
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	15,000,000	50,000	2,728		52,728
Federal Agencies	3130AWC24	FHLB 4.000 06/09/2028	10,000,000	33,333	91		33,424
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	FHLB 4.125 06/14/2030	12,515,000	43,020	(1,074)		41,947
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	FHLB 4.125 06/14/2030	16,000,000	55,000	(1,043)		53,957
Federal Agencies	3130AWLZ1	FHLB 4.750 06/12/2026	50,000,000	197,917	4,045		201,962
Federal Agencies	3130AX4E5	FHLB 4.500 06/11/2027	11,000,000	41,250	1,676		42,926
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	10,000,000	40,625	1,604		42,229
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	10,000,000	40,625	1,716		42,341
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	10,000,000	40,625	1,716		42,341
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	25,000,000	101,563	(2,281)		99,282
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	36,730,000	149,216	(3,104)		146,112
Federal Agencies	3130AXCP1	FHLB 4.875 09/11/2026	11,895,000	48,323	2,069		50,392
Federal Agencies	3130AXU63	FHLB 4.625 11/17/2026	50,000,000	192,708	2,422		195,131
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	12,000,000	41,250	749		41,999
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	25,000,000	85,938	1,560		87,497
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	29,350,000	100,891	1,831		102,722
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	50,000,000	171,875	3,119		174,994
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	17,000,000	67,292	1,232		68,524
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	20,000,000	79,167	1,449		80,616
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	40,000,000	158,333	2,898		161,232
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	48,000,000	190,000	3,478		193,478
Federal Agencies	3130B1BC0	FHLB 4.625 06/08/2029	9,705,000	37,405	(5,079)		32,326
Federal Agencies	3130B1BT3	FHLB 4.875 06/12/2026	13,485,000	54,783	(833)		53,950

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accrued Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130B1EF0	FHLB 4.625 06/11/2027	20,700,000	79,781	(2,691)		77,090
Federal Agencies	3130B2KJ3	FHLB 4.625 09/04/2029		19,271			19,271
Federal Agencies	3130B2KJ3	FHLB 4.625 09/04/2029		9,635			9,635
Federal Agencies	3130B2KJ3	FHLB 4.625 09/04/2029		9,635			9,635
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	19,000,000	57,396	1,051		58,447
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	25,000,000	75,521	1,384		76,904
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	25,900,000	78,240	1,433		79,673
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	50,000,000	151,042	2,767		153,809
Federal Agencies	3130B2TG0	FHLB 4.375 09/24/2029		69,878			69,878
Federal Agencies	3130B2TG0	FHLB 4.375 09/24/2029		69,878			69,878
Federal Agencies	3130B2TG0	FHLB 4.375 09/24/2029		181,684			181,684
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	3130B2XR1	FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029	65,000,000	217,208			217,208
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	15,000,000	50,000	130		50,130
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	25,000,000	83,333	216		83,550
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	25,000,000	83,333	216		83,550
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	50,000,000	166,667	433		167,099
Federal Agencies	3130B3GD9	FHLB 4.000 11/27/2028	47,025,000	156,750	1,703		158,453
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	3130B6MU7	FHLB 4.590 06/15/2028	50,000,000	191,250			191,250
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	10,000,000	32,292	553		32,845
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	13,000,000	41,979	719		42,699
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	16,500,000	53,281	913		54,194
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	20,000,000	64,583	1,107		65,690
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	36,000,000	116,250	1,992		118,242
Federal Agencies	313385LF1	FHDN 0.000 09/03/2025			11,806		11,806
Federal Agencies	313385LF1	FHDN 0.000 09/03/2025			11,806		11,806
Federal Agencies	313385LG9	FHDN 0.000 09/04/2025			11,806		11,806
Federal Agencies	313385LG9	FHDN 0.000 09/04/2025			11,806		11,806
Federal Agencies	313385LH7	FHDN 0.000 09/05/2025			4,392		4,392
Federal Agencies	313385LH7	FHDN 0.000 09/05/2025			9,931		9,931
Federal Agencies	313385LH7	FHDN 0.000 09/05/2025			11,806		11,806
Federal Agencies	313385LP9	FHDN 0.000 09/11/2025			11,750		11,750
Federal Agencies	313385LQ7	FHDN 0.000 09/12/2025			5,791		5,791
Federal Agencies	313385LQ7	FHDN 0.000 09/12/2025			5,861		5,861
Federal Agencies	313385LW4	FHDN 0.000 09/18/2025			6,281		6,281
Federal Agencies	313385LW4	FHDN 0.000 09/18/2025			5,903		5,903
Federal Agencies	313385MD5	FHDN 0.000 09/25/2025			5,815		5,815
Federal Agencies	313385VP8	FHDN 0.000 04/15/2026	25,000,000		76,931		76,931
Federal Agencies	3133EM4X7	FFCB 0.800 09/10/2026	28,975,000	19,317	83,770		103,087
Federal Agencies	3133EMZ21	FFCB 0.690 04/06/2026	15,500,000	8,913	738		9,651
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	4,650,000	15,984	59		16,043
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	5,000,000	17,188	63		17,251
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	21,000,000	72,188	238		72,425
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	25,000,000	85,938	315		86,253
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	FFCB 4.000 12/29/2025	15,000,000	50,000	1,240		51,240

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accrued Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	FFCB 4.000 12/29/2025	20,000,000	66,667	1,653		68,320
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	FFCB 4.000 12/29/2025	25,000,000	83,333	2,087		85,420
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	FFCB 4.000 01/13/2026	20,000,000	66,667	482		67,148
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	FFCB 4.000 01/13/2026	30,000,000	100,000	624		100,624
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	FFCB 1.050 11/17/2025	39,675,000	34,716	1,084		35,799
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	FFCB 1.050 11/17/2025	55,000,000	48,125	1,581		49,706
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	FFCB 1.170 12/16/2025	45,000,000	43,875	943		44,818
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	FFCB 1.170 12/16/2025	50,000,000	48,750	1,047		49,797
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ35	FFCB 3.320 02/25/2026	35,000,000	96,833	993		97,826
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	FFCB 1.680 03/10/2027	48,573,000	68,002	18,807		86,810
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	22,500,000	48,750	1,770		50,520
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	24,500,000	53,083	2,022		55,105
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	25,000,000	54,167	3,222		57,389
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	FFCB 2.640 04/08/2026	20,000,000	44,000	797		44,797
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	FFCB 2.640 04/08/2026	30,000,000	66,000	1,195		67,195
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	FFCB 3.240 06/28/2027	27,865,000	75,236	(3,865)		71,371
Federal Agencies	3133EP5K7	FFCB 4.500 03/13/2026	50,000,000	187,500	10,225		197,725
Federal Agencies	3133EP5S0	FFCB 4.250 03/20/2028	4,971,000	17,606	1,131		18,737
Federal Agencies	3133EP5U5	FFCB 4.125 03/20/2029	51,660,000	177,581	10,819		188,401
Federal Agencies	3133EP6K6	FFCB 4.500 03/26/2027	50,000,000	187,500	2,482		189,982
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	1,273		92,419
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026	28,000,000	102,083	1,257		103,340
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026	50,000,000	182,292	2,245		184,536
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	FFCB 4.125 08/23/2027	10,000,000	34,375	475		34,850
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	12,000,000	46,250	262		46,512
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	20,000,000	77,083	466		77,550
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	55,000,000	211,979	1,276		213,255
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	FFCB 4.625 11/15/2027	27,950,000	107,724	2,382		110,106
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	FFCB 4.625 11/15/2027	33,300,000	128,344	2,845		131,188
Federal Agencies	3133EPDL6	FFCB 4.850 10/01/2025	50,000,000	202,083			202,083
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026	25,000,000	75,521	2,130		77,651
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026	30,000,000	90,625	2,815		93,440
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	20,000,000	70,833	843		71,676
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	24,700,000	87,479	1,636		89,115
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	30,000,000	106,250	1,330		107,580
Federal Agencies	3133EPMV4	FFCB 4.125 06/15/2027	28,940,000	99,481	576		100,058
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	363		91,509
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	363		91,509
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	50,000,000	182,292	725		183,017
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	FFCB 4.000 05/20/2027	31,000,000	103,333	2,267		105,601
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	FFCB 4.000 05/20/2027	58,850,000	196,167	4,516		200,683
Federal Agencies	3133EPSK2	FFCB 4.250 08/07/2028	19,500,000	69,063	1,441		70,503
Federal Agencies	3133EPSW6	FFCB 4.500 08/14/2026	50,000,000	187,500	3,148		190,648
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	10,000,000	37,500	343		37,843
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	15,000,000	56,250	611		56,861
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	25,000,000	93,750	928		94,678
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	33,000,000	123,750	1,561		125,311
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	10,000,000	39,583	241		39,824
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	19,000,000	75,208	441		75,649

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accrued Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	21,000,000	83,125	500		83,625
Federal Agencies	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025		16,003	113		16,116
Federal Agencies	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025		29,167	348		29,514
Federal Agencies	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025		38,889	463		39,352
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	5,000,000	17,188	196		17,383
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	10,000,000	34,375	367		34,742
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	25,000,000	85,938	862		86,800
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	35,000,000	120,313	1,207		121,520
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	50,000,000	171,875	1,834		173,709
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	FFCB 5.125 10/20/2025	24,000,000	102,500	3,142		105,642
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	FFCB 5.125 10/20/2025	25,000,000	106,771	595		107,366
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	FFCB 5.125 10/20/2025	35,000,000	149,479	1,135		150,614
Federal Agencies	3133EPYW9	FFCB 5.125 10/20/2025	50,000,000	213,542	1,149		214,691
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	FFCB 4.875 10/20/2026	14,000,000	56,875	2,602		59,477
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	FFCB 4.875 10/20/2026	30,000,000	121,875	4,541		126,416
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	3,000,000	12,500	241		12,741
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	9,615,000	40,063	773		40,835
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	16,000,000	66,667	1,286		67,953
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	25,000,000	104,167	1,890		106,057
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	FFCB 4.250 11/03/2027	5,000,000	17,708	19		17,728
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	FFCB 4.250 11/03/2027	41,880,000	148,325	68		148,393
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	2,000,000	7,083	88		7,171
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	25,000,000	88,542	1,058		89,600
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	30,000,000	106,250	1,332		107,582
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	FFCB 4.500 01/18/2030	12,815,000	48,056	(3,532)		44,524
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	FFCB 4.500 01/18/2030	18,000,000	67,500	(4,937)		62,563
Federal Agencies	3133ER7L9	FFCB 4.000 03/18/2030	8,695,000	28,983	389		29,373
Federal Agencies	3133ERD24	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	30,000,000	106,250	602		106,852
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029	27,892,000	110,406	(4,946)		105,459
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029	30,000,000	118,750	(5,238)		113,512
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029	63,085,000	249,711	(11,201)		238,510
Federal Agencies	3133ERDS7	FFCB 4.750 05/06/2027	12,727,000	50,378	(365)		50,013
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	14,934,000	56,003	(584)		55,418
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	15,000,000	56,250	111		56,361
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	20,000,000	75,000	(782)		74,218
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	10,000,000	35,417	537		35,953
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	10,000,000	35,417	537		35,953
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	10,000,000	35,417	537		35,953
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	20,000,000	70,833	1,073		71,907
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	29,000,000	102,708	1,263		103,972
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026	20,000,000	81,250	(1,260)		79,990
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026	32,000,000	130,000	(2,122)		127,878
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	FFCB 4.250 10/20/2028	5,000,000	17,708	529		18,237
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	FFCB 4.250 10/20/2028	38,000,000	134,583	4,069		138,652
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	21,000,000	72,188	1,743		73,930
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	25,505,000	87,673	2,110		89,783
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	33,000,000	113,438	2,948		116,386
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	38,343,000	131,804	3,182		134,986
Federal Agencies	3133ERJZ5	FFCB 4.500 06/28/2027	30,000,000	112,500	388		112,888

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accrued Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	FFCB 4.500 07/08/2027	25,000,000	93,750	(912)		92,838
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	FFCB 4.500 07/08/2027	25,000,000	93,750	(700)		93,050
Federal Agencies	3133ERKX8	FFCB 4.250 07/12/2029	20,000,000	70,833	177		71,011
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	FFCB 4.250 07/23/2027	10,000,000	35,417	96		35,513
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	FFCB 4.250 07/23/2027	15,000,000	53,125	144		53,269
Federal Agencies	3133ERT84	FFCB 4.250 01/14/2028	29,750,000	105,365	4,768		110,133
Federal Agencies	3133ERVR9	FFCB 3.500 07/01/2027	55,000,000	160,417	2,235		162,652
Federal Agencies	3133ERWR8	FFCB 3.500 01/07/2027	12,500,000	36,458	4,613		41,072
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	FFCB 3.875 10/15/2027	5,000,000	16,146	75		16,221
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	FFCB 3.875 10/15/2027	8,000,000	25,833	105		25,939
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	FFCB 4.250 01/28/2028	47,000,000	166,458	659		167,117
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	FFCB 4.250 01/28/2028	50,000,000	177,083	701		177,784
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	15,000,000	50,000	104		50,104
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	32,260,000	107,533	266		107,800
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	43,020,000	143,400	1,911		145,311
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	46,750,000	155,833	285		156,119
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	50,000,000	166,667	7,823		174,490
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	FFCB 4.000 02/23/2027	10,000,000	33,333	290		33,624
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	FFCB 4.000 02/23/2027	45,000,000	150,000	1,306		151,306
Federal Agencies	3133ETJS7	FFCB 4.000 11/10/2026	12,600,000	42,000	1,056		43,056
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	FFCB 4.000 11/30/2029	15,000,000	50,000	996		50,996
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	FFCB 4.000 11/30/2029	23,000,000	76,667	1,422		78,089
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	FFCB 3.875 06/05/2028	7,370,000	23,799	755		24,554
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	FFCB 3.875 06/05/2028	25,000,000	80,729	1,170		81,899
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	FFCB 4.000 10/09/2029	10,000,000	33,333	237		33,570
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	FFCB 4.000 10/09/2029	15,000,000	50,000	355		50,355
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	9,750,000	32,500	65		32,565
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	10,000,000	33,333	427		33,760
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	15,000,000	50,000	23		50,023
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	20,000,000	66,667	904		67,570
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	25,000,000	83,333	579		83,912
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	10,070,000	33,567	(131)		33,436
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	15,000,000	50,000	(214)		49,786
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	16,944,000	56,480	113		56,593
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	41,000,000	136,667	(586)		136,081
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	5,000,000	16,667	187		16,854
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	14,450,000	48,167	559		48,726
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	25,000,000	83,333	967		84,300
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	22,500,000	70,313	2,083		72,396
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	25,000,000	78,125	2,640		80,765
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	50,000,000	156,250	4,684		160,934
Federal Agencies	3133ETPF8	FFCB 3.750 07/08/2030	20,000,000	62,500	3,689		66,189
Federal Agencies	3133ETSX6	FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027	5,000,000	15,104	413		15,517
Federal Agencies	3133ETSX6	FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027	5,000,000	15,104	421		15,525
Federal Agencies	3133ETSX6	FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027	7,000,000	21,146	578		21,724
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027	15,000,000	46,875	1,090		47,965
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027	25,000,000	78,125	1,776		79,901
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027	35,000,000	109,375	2,697		112,072
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027	40,000,000	125,000	2,907		127,907

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accrued Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029		72,872			72,872
Federal Agencies	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029		225,904			225,904
Federal Agencies	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029		72,872			72,872
Federal Agencies	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029		72,872			72,872
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	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	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	3136GAFL8	FNMA 4.710 10/15/2029	50,000,000	196,250			196,250
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	25,000,000	2,799			2,799
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	25,000,000	2,799			2,799
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	25,000,000	2,799			2,799
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	25,000,000	2,799			2,799
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	50,000,000	5,597			5,597
Federal Agencies	3137EAEX3	FHLMC 0.375 09/23/2025		5,179	4,028		9,207
Subtotals			\$ 6,467,204,000	\$ 20,495,791	\$ 461,398	\$ -	\$ 20,957,188
Public Time Deposits	PPGQE6C86	FIVSTR 4.290 11/17/2025	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 71,500			\$ 71,500
Public Time Deposits	PPGQEWEX2	BRIDGE 4.340 12/15/2025	10,000,000	35,671			35,671
Public Time Deposits	PPGUALS16	BKSANF 4.310 12/08/2025	10,000,000	35,917			35,917
Public Time Deposits	PPGUCT9Z3	BRIDGE 4.330 01/12/2026	10,000,000	35,589			35,589
Public Time Deposits	PPGZ3O8Q4	BKSANF 4.330 01/05/2026	10,000,000	36,083			36,083
Subtotals			\$ 60,000,000	\$ 214,760	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 214,760
Negotiable CDs	06367DMX0	BMOCHG 4.570 10/24/2025	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 190,417			\$ 190,417
Negotiable CDs	06367DN92	BMOCHG 4.530 09/22/2025		132,125			132,125
Negotiable CDs	06367DPW9	BMOCHG 4.350 10/24/2025	50,000,000	181,250			181,250
Negotiable CDs	06367DQ32	BMOCHG 4.330 02/09/2026	75,000,000	270,625			270,625
Negotiable CDs	06367DQK4	BMOCHG 4.320 01/12/2026	50,000,000	180,000			180,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DQP3	BMOCHG 4.430 02/11/2026	70,000,000	258,417			258,417
Negotiable CDs	06367DRH0	BMOCHG 4.330 03/24/2026	50,000,000	180,417			180,417
Negotiable CDs	06367DRJ6	BMOCHG 4.000 06/15/2026	50,000,000	180,417			180,417
Negotiable CDs	06367DRZ0	BMOCHG 4.170 06/01/2026	100,000,000	347,500			347,500
Negotiable CDs	06367DS97	BMOCHG 4.200 06/15/2026	100,000,000	350,000			350,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DSQ9	BMOCHG 4.000 06/09/2026	46,000,000	112,444			112,444
Negotiable CDs	06367DSR7	BMOCHG 4.000 06/15/2026	54,000,000	132,000			132,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DSV8	BMOCHG 3.980 06/17/2026	55,000,000	42,564			42,564
Negotiable CDs	06418NHV7	BNSHOU 4.270 07/01/2026	100,000,000	355,833			355,833
Negotiable CDs	06418NJE3	BNSHOU 4.200 04/20/2026	125,000,000	437,500			437,500
Negotiable CDs	06418NJK9	BNSHOU 4.110 04/23/2026	100,000,000	319,667			319,667
Negotiable CDs	13606DCE0	CIBCNY 4.550 10/24/2025	50,000,000	189,583			189,583
Negotiable CDs	13606DCV2	CIBCNY 4.530 09/22/2025		198,187			198,187
Negotiable CDs	13606DFF4	CIBCNY 4.420 09/24/2025		310,628			310,628
Negotiable CDs	13606DGY2	CIBCNY 4.360 01/22/2026	60,000,000	218,000			218,000

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accrued Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Negotiable CDs	13606DGZ9	CIBCNY 4.360 01/28/2026	80,000,000	290,667			290,667
Negotiable CDs	13606DHE5	CIBCNY 4.340 12/15/2025	75,000,000	271,250			271,250
Negotiable CDs	13606DHF2	CIBCNY 4.330 02/09/2026	50,000,000	180,417			180,417
Negotiable CDs	13606DKH4	CIBCNY 4.330 01/20/2026	60,000,000	216,500			216,500
Negotiable CDs	78015J2Y2	RY 4.550 09/08/2025		57,507			57,507
Negotiable CDs	78015J3L9	RY 4.510 11/20/2025	60,000,000	225,500			225,500
Negotiable CDs	78015J3U9	RY 4.560 11/19/2025	50,000,000	190,000			190,000
Negotiable CDs	78015JG84	RY 4.330 02/23/2026	60,000,000	216,500			216,500
Negotiable CDs	78015JGQ4	RY 4.380 03/06/2026	50,000,000	182,500			182,500
Negotiable CDs	78015JJ81	RY 4.290 03/16/2026	100,000,000	357,500			357,500
Negotiable CDs	78015JJQ1	RY 4.330 04/07/2026	50,000,000	180,417			180,417
Negotiable CDs	78015JL88	RY 4.060 07/01/2026	100,000,000	338,333			338,333
Negotiable CDs	78015JMC8	RY 4.180 04/23/2026	100,000,000	348,333			348,333
Negotiable CDs	89115DEG7	TDNY 4.410 03/11/2026	50,000,000	183,750			183,750
Negotiable CDs	89115DHC3	TDNY 4.400 03/16/2026	60,000,000	220,000			220,000
Negotiable CDs	89115DPK6	TDNY 4.490 10/24/2025	100,000,000	374,167			374,167
Negotiable CDs	89115DQT6	TDNY 4.540 01/12/2026	100,000,000	378,333			378,333
Negotiable CDs	89115DWB8	TDNY 4.360 09/05/2025		24,222			24,222
Negotiable CDs	89115DWF9	TDNY 4.360 09/10/2025		54,500			54,500
Negotiable CDs	89115DWK8	TDNY 4.350 11/05/2025	50,000,000	181,250			181,250
Negotiable CDs	89115DWT9	TDNY 4.360 01/28/2026	50,000,000	181,667			181,667
Negotiable CDs	89115DXB7	TDNY 4.340 12/15/2025	60,000,000	217,000			217,000
Negotiable CDs	89115DXF8	TDNY 4.340 12/29/2025	65,000,000	235,083			235,083
Negotiable CDs	96130AA24	WSTNY 4.350 03/16/2026	100,000,000	362,500			362,500
Negotiable CDs	96130AA65	WSTNY 4.380 03/23/2026	140,000,000	511,000			511,000
Negotiable CDs	96130AC22	WSTNY 4.320 06/15/2026	100,000,000	360,000			360,000
Negotiable CDs	96130AZR2	WSTNY 4.350 12/03/2025	100,000,000	362,500			362,500
Negotiable CDs	96130AZZ4	WSTNY 4.350 05/04/2026	125,000,000	453,125			453,125
Subtotals			\$ 3,120,000,000	\$ 11,742,094	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,742,094
Commercial Paper	03785DW93	APPINC 0.000 09/09/2025			\$ 21,350		\$ 21,350
Commercial Paper	03785DWF9	APPINC 0.000 09/15/2025			16,333		16,333
Commercial Paper	14912DW21	CATFIN 0.000 09/02/2025			12,028		12,028
Commercial Paper	14912DW21	CATFIN 0.000 09/02/2025			5,986		5,986
Commercial Paper	14912DW39	CATFIN 0.000 09/03/2025			10,151		10,151
Commercial Paper	14912DW96	CATFIN 0.000 09/09/2025			47,889		47,889
Commercial Paper	14912DWP0	CATFIN 0.000 09/23/2025			11,332		11,332
Commercial Paper	14912DWR6	CATFIN 0.000 09/25/2025			31,889		31,889
Commercial Paper	14912DWW5	CATFIN 0.000 09/30/2025			80,111		80,111
Commercial Paper	14912DX12	CATFIN 0.000 10/01/2025	100,000,000		102,750		102,750
Commercial Paper	14912DX87	CATFIN 0.000 10/08/2025	100,000,000		22,778		22,778
Commercial Paper	14912DXL8	CATFIN 0.000 10/20/2025	30,450,000		6,936		6,936
Commercial Paper	62479LWF8	MUFGBK 0.000 09/15/2025			33,133		33,133
Commercial Paper	62479LWP6	MUFGBK 0.000 09/23/2025			91,117		91,117
Commercial Paper	62479LX67	MUFGBK 0.000 10/06/2025	25,000,000		88,542		88,542
Commercial Paper	62479LXF7	MUFGBK 0.000 10/15/2025	11,000,000		38,867		38,867
Commercial Paper	62479LXL4	MUFGBK 0.000 10/20/2025	15,000,000		53,000		53,000
Commercial Paper	62479LXN0	MUFGBK 0.000 10/22/2025	55,000,000		194,333		194,333
Commercial Paper	62479LXV2	MUFGBK 0.000 10/29/2025	15,000,000		53,625		53,625

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accrued Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Commercial Paper	62479LY33	MUFGBK 0.000 11/03/2025	10,000,000		36,167		36,167
Commercial Paper	62479LY74	MUFGBK 0.000 11/07/2025	11,000,000		39,692		39,692
Commercial Paper	62479LYH2	MUFGBK 0.000 11/17/2025	38,000,000		136,483		136,483
Commercial Paper	62479LYM1	MUFGBK 0.000 11/21/2025	26,000,000		93,383		93,383
Commercial Paper	62479LYS8	MUFGBK 0.000 11/26/2025	15,000,000		53,750		53,750
Commercial Paper	62479MB69	MUFGBK 0.000 02/06/2026	25,000,000		89,375		89,375
Commercial Paper	62479MC92	MUFGBK 0.000 03/09/2026	130,000,000		466,917		466,917
Commercial Paper	62479MCQ4	MUFGBK 0.000 03/24/2026	100,000,000		354,167		354,167
Commercial Paper	62479MD67	MUFGBK 0.000 04/06/2026	110,000,000		391,417		391,417
Commercial Paper	62479MDN0	MUFGBK 0.000 04/22/2026	51,000,000		161,443		161,443
Commercial Paper	89116EZ55	TDHUSA 0.000 12/05/2025	11,000,000		38,958		38,958
Commercial Paper	89116EZF3	TDHUSA 0.000 12/15/2025	25,000,000		88,333		88,333
Commercial Paper	89116EZP1	TDHUSA 0.000 12/23/2025	40,000,000		140,333		140,333
Commercial Paper	89233GW85	TOYCC 0.000 09/08/2025			54,979		54,979
Commercial Paper	89233GX84	TOYCC 0.000 10/08/2025	60,000,000		215,000		215,000
Commercial Paper	89233GXP6	TOYCC 0.000 10/23/2025	75,000,000		276,875		276,875
Commercial Paper	89233GXQ4	TOYCC 0.000 10/24/2025	50,000,000		180,417		180,417
Commercial Paper	89233GZ17	TOYCC 0.000 12/01/2025	125,000,000		436,458		436,458
Commercial Paper	89233GZF6	TOYCC 0.000 12/15/2025	75,000,000		261,250		261,250
Commercial Paper	89233HEL4	TOYCC 0.000 05/20/2026	55,000,000		131,419		131,419
Commercial Paper	89233HEN0	TOYCC 0.000 05/22/2026	100,000,000		339,167		339,167
Commercial Paper	89233HF33	TOYCC 0.000 06/03/2026	60,000,000		143,000		143,000
Subtotals			\$ 1,543,450,000	\$ -	\$ 5,051,133	\$ -	\$ 5,051,133
Medium Term Notes	037833CJ7	AAPL 3.350 02/09/2027	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 139,583	\$ 14,211		\$ 153,794
Medium Term Notes	14913UAN0	CAT 4.450 10/16/2026	18,385,000	68,178	(8,521)		59,657
Medium Term Notes	24422EXV6	DE 4.200 07/15/2027	10,000,000	35,000	40		35,040
Medium Term Notes	24422EYD5	DE 4.250 06/05/2028	25,000,000	88,542	609		89,151
Medium Term Notes	594918BJ2	MSFT 3.125 11/03/2025	11,749,000	30,596	7,356		37,952
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026	6,452,000	18,281	6,806		25,087
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026	13,009,000	36,859	13,650		50,509
Medium Term Notes	89236TMY8	TOYOTA 4.600 01/08/2027	40,000,000	153,333	905		154,239
Subtotals			\$ 174,595,000	\$ 570,372	\$ 35,056	\$ -	\$ 605,428
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	\$ 14,468,843	\$ 48,366			\$ 48,366
Money Market Funds	31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	835,215,136	2,884,820			2,884,820
Money Market Funds	608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	325,092,234	563,528			563,528
Money Market Funds	262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	15,052,480	50,772			50,772
Money Market Funds	85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	13,480,145	78,827			78,827
Money Market Funds	61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	13,636,922	46,081			46,081
Subtotals			\$ 1,216,945,761	\$ 3,672,393	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,672,393

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

<u>Type of Investment</u>	<u>CUSIP</u>	<u>Issuer Name</u>	<u>Par Value</u>	<u>Accrued Interest Earned</u>	<u>(Amortization) / Accretion</u>	<u>Realized Gain/(Loss)</u>	<u>Total Earnings</u>
Supranationals	45818WDG8	IADB 0.820 02/27/2026	\$ 19,500,000	\$ 13,325	\$ (1,037)		\$ 12,288
Supranationals	4581X0EN4	IADB 4.125 02/15/2029	25,000,000	85,938	6,261		92,198
Supranationals	4581X0EN4	IADB 4.125 02/15/2029	50,000,000	171,875	3,100		174,975
Supranationals	459058KC6	IBRD 0.700 11/16/2026	55,000,000	65,313	42,626		107,939
Supranationals	459058KJ1	IBRD 3.125 06/15/2027	12,323,000	32,091	10,969		43,060
Supranationals	45950VRU2	IFC 4.023 01/26/2026	100,000,000	335,250			335,250
Subtotals			\$ 261,823,000	\$ 703,791	\$ 61,920	\$ -	\$ 765,711
Secured Bank Deposit	0660P0999	Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct	\$ 362,344,940	\$ 1,258,855			\$ 1,258,855
Subtotals			\$ 362,344,940	\$ 1,258,855	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,258,855
Grand Totals			\$16,968,362,702	\$ 46,993,888	\$ 6,647,491	\$ -	\$ 53,641,379

Investment Transactions

Pooled Fund

For month ended September 30, 2025										
Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Price	Settlement Date	Posted Date	Par Value	Principal	Accrued Interest	Total
58797	Buy	313385LF1	FHDN 0.000 09/03/2025	99.98819	09/02/2025	09/02/2025	100,000,000.00	99,988,194.44	0.00	99,988,194.44
58798	Buy	313385LF1	FHDN 0.000 09/03/2025	99.98819	09/02/2025	09/02/2025	100,000,000.00	99,988,194.44	0.00	99,988,194.44
58799	Buy	313385VP8	FHDN 0.000 04/15/2026	97.61250	09/02/2025	09/02/2025	25,000,000.00	24,403,125.00	0.00	24,403,125.00
58801	Buy	313385LG9	FHDN 0.000 09/04/2025	99.98819	09/03/2025	09/03/2025	100,000,000.00	99,988,194.44	0.00	99,988,194.44
58802	Buy	313385LG9	FHDN 0.000 09/04/2025	99.98819	09/03/2025	09/03/2025	100,000,000.00	99,988,194.44	0.00	99,988,194.44
58803	Buy	62479MDN0	MUFGBK 0.000 04/22/2026	97.38842	09/03/2025	09/03/2025	51,000,000.00	49,668,092.50	0.00	49,668,092.50
58804	Buy	06418NJK9	BNSHOU 4.110 04/23/2026	100.00000	09/03/2025	09/03/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
58800	Buy	912797QF7	B 0.000 10/16/2025	99.51117	09/04/2025	09/04/2025	100,000,000.00	99,511,167.00	0.00	99,511,167.00
58805	Buy	313385LH7	FHDN 0.000 09/05/2025	99.98819	09/04/2025	09/04/2025	37,200,000.00	37,195,608.33	0.00	37,195,608.33
58806	Buy	313385LH7	FHDN 0.000 09/05/2025	99.98819	09/04/2025	09/04/2025	84,125,000.00	84,115,068.58	0.00	84,115,068.58
58807	Buy	313385LH7	FHDN 0.000 09/05/2025	99.98819	09/04/2025	09/04/2025	100,000,000.00	99,988,194.44	0.00	99,988,194.44
58808	Buy	14912DW96	CATFIN 0.000 09/09/2025	99.95211	09/05/2025	09/05/2025	100,000,000.00	99,952,111.11	0.00	99,952,111.11
58809	Buy	03785DW93	APPINC 0.000 09/09/2025	99.95256	09/05/2025	09/05/2025	45,000,000.00	44,978,650.00	0.00	44,978,650.00
58810	Buy	89233HEL4	TOYCC 0.000 05/20/2026	97.25214	09/09/2025	09/09/2025	55,000,000.00	53,488,676.39	0.00	53,488,676.39
58811	Buy	89233HF33	TOYCC 0.000 06/03/2026	97.10750	09/09/2025	09/09/2025	60,000,000.00	58,264,500.00	0.00	58,264,500.00
58812	Buy	06367DSQ9	BMOCHG 4.000	100.00000	09/09/2025	09/09/2025	46,000,000.00	46,000,000.00	0.00	46,000,000.00
58813	Buy	06367DSR7	BMOCHG 4.000	100.00000	09/09/2025	09/09/2025	54,000,000.00	54,000,000.00	0.00	54,000,000.00
58814	Buy	313385LP9	FHDN 0.000 09/11/2025	99.98825	09/10/2025	09/10/2025	100,000,000.00	99,988,250.00	0.00	99,988,250.00
58815	Buy	313385LQ7	FHDN 0.000 09/12/2025	99.98828	09/11/2025	09/11/2025	49,400,000.00	49,394,209.22	0.00	49,394,209.22
58816	Buy	313385LQ7	FHDN 0.000 09/12/2025	99.98828	09/11/2025	09/11/2025	50,000,000.00	49,994,138.89	0.00	49,994,138.89
58817	Buy	459058KC6	IBRD 0.700 11/16/2026	98.24600	09/12/2025	09/12/2025	55,000,000.00	54,035,300.00	398,750.00	54,434,050.00
58818	Buy	313385LW4	FHDN 0.000 09/18/2025	99.98819	09/17/2025	09/17/2025	53,200,000.00	53,193,719.44	0.00	53,193,719.44
58819	Buy	313385LW4	FHDN 0.000 09/18/2025	99.98819	09/17/2025	09/17/2025	50,000,000.00	49,994,097.22	0.00	49,994,097.22
58825	Buy	14912DWR6	CATFIN 0.000 09/25/2025	99.92028	09/18/2025	09/18/2025	40,000,000.00	39,968,111.11	0.00	39,968,111.11
58826	Buy	14912DWP0	CATFIN 0.000 09/23/2025	99.94306	09/18/2025	09/18/2025	19,900,000.00	19,888,668.06	0.00	19,888,668.06
58827	Buy	14912DX12	CATFIN 0.000 10/01/2025	99.89725	09/22/2025	09/22/2025	100,000,000.00	99,897,250.00	0.00	99,897,250.00
58828	Buy	14912DWW5	CATFIN 0.000 09/30/2025	99.91989	09/23/2025	09/23/2025	100,000,000.00	99,919,888.89	0.00	99,919,888.89
58829	Buy	06367DSV8	BMOCHG 3.980	100.00000	09/24/2025	09/24/2025	55,000,000.00	55,000,000.00	0.00	55,000,000.00
58830	Buy	313385MD5	FHDN 0.000 09/25/2025	99.98886	09/24/2025	09/24/2025	52,205,000.00	52,199,184.94	0.00	52,199,184.94
58836	Buy	14912DX87	CATFIN 0.000 10/08/2025	99.89750	09/29/2025	09/29/2025	100,000,000.00	99,897,500.00	0.00	99,897,500.00
58837	Buy	14912DXL8	CATFIN 0.000 10/20/2025	99.76083	09/29/2025	09/29/2025	30,450,000.00	30,377,173.75	0.00	30,377,173.75
58820	Buy	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	100.00000	09/30/2025	09/30/2025	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	0.00	25,000,000.00
58821	Buy	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	100.00000	09/30/2025	09/30/2025	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	0.00	25,000,000.00
58822	Buy	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	100.00000	09/30/2025	09/30/2025	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	0.00	25,000,000.00
58823	Buy	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	100.00000	09/30/2025	09/30/2025	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	0.00	25,000,000.00
58824	Buy	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	100.00000	09/30/2025	09/30/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
Activity Total							2,262,480,000.00	2,255,265,462.63	398,750.00	2,255,664,212.63

Investment Transactions

Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Price	Settlement Date	Posted Date	Par Value	Principal	Accrued Interest	Total
58785	Maturity	14912DW21	CATFIN 0.000 09/02/2025	100.00000	09/02/2025	09/02/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
58796	Maturity	14912DW21	CATFIN 0.000 09/02/2025	100.00000	09/02/2025	09/02/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
58649	Maturity	912797QM2	B 0.000 09/02/2025	100.00000	09/02/2025	09/02/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
58783	Maturity	14912DW39	CATFIN 0.000 09/03/2025	100.00000	09/03/2025	09/03/2025	42,200,000.00	42,200,000.00	0.00	42,200,000.00
58797	Maturity	313385LF1	FHDN 0.000 09/03/2025	100.00000	09/03/2025	09/03/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
58798	Maturity	313385LF1	FHDN 0.000 09/03/2025	100.00000	09/03/2025	09/03/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
58305	Full Call	3130B2KJ3	FHLB 4.625 09/04/2029	100.00000	09/04/2025	09/04/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
58306	Full Call	3130B2KJ3	FHLB 4.625 09/04/2029	100.00000	09/04/2025	09/04/2025	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	0.00	25,000,000.00
58307	Full Call	3130B2KJ3	FHLB 4.625 09/04/2029	100.00000	09/04/2025	09/04/2025	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	0.00	25,000,000.00
58801	Maturity	313385LG9	FHDN 0.000 09/04/2025	100.00000	09/04/2025	09/04/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
58802	Maturity	313385LG9	FHDN 0.000 09/04/2025	100.00000	09/04/2025	09/04/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
58805	Maturity	313385LH7	FHDN 0.000 09/05/2025	100.00000	09/05/2025	09/05/2025	37,200,000.00	37,200,000.00	0.00	37,200,000.00
58806	Maturity	313385LH7	FHDN 0.000 09/05/2025	100.00000	09/05/2025	09/05/2025	84,125,000.00	84,125,000.00	0.00	84,125,000.00
58807	Maturity	313385LH7	FHDN 0.000 09/05/2025	100.00000	09/05/2025	09/05/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
58571	Maturity	89115DWB8	TDNY 4.360 09/05/2025	100.00000	09/05/2025	09/05/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
58446	Maturity	78015J2Y2	RY 4.550 09/08/2025	100.00000	09/08/2025	09/08/2025	65,000,000.00	65,000,000.00	0.00	65,000,000.00
58499	Maturity	89233GW85	TOYCC 0.000 09/08/2025	100.00000	09/08/2025	09/08/2025	65,000,000.00	65,000,000.00	0.00	65,000,000.00
58809	Maturity	03785DW93	APPINC 0.000 09/09/2025	100.00000	09/09/2025	09/09/2025	45,000,000.00	45,000,000.00	0.00	45,000,000.00
58808	Maturity	14912DW96	CATFIN 0.000 09/09/2025	100.00000	09/09/2025	09/09/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
58572	Maturity	89115DWF9	TDNY 4.360 09/10/2025	100.00000	09/10/2025	09/10/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
58814	Maturity	313385LP9	FHDN 0.000 09/11/2025	100.00000	09/11/2025	09/11/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
47196	Maturity	3130A8ZQ9	FHLB 1.750 09/12/2025	100.00000	09/12/2025	09/12/2025	10,295,000.00	10,295,000.00	0.00	10,295,000.00
58815	Maturity	313385LQ7	FHDN 0.000 09/12/2025	100.00000	09/12/2025	09/12/2025	49,400,000.00	49,400,000.00	0.00	49,400,000.00
58816	Maturity	313385LQ7	FHDN 0.000 09/12/2025	100.00000	09/12/2025	09/12/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
58641	Maturity	03785DWF9	APPINC 0.000 09/15/2025	100.00000	09/15/2025	09/15/2025	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	0.00	10,000,000.00
57743	Maturity	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025	100.00000	09/15/2025	09/15/2025	8,230,000.00	8,230,000.00	0.00	8,230,000.00
57744	Maturity	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025	100.00000	09/15/2025	09/15/2025	15,000,000.00	15,000,000.00	0.00	15,000,000.00
57745	Maturity	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025	100.00000	09/15/2025	09/15/2025	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00	0.00	20,000,000.00
58593	Maturity	62479LWF8	MUFGBK 0.000 09/15/2025	100.00000	09/15/2025	09/15/2025	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00	0.00	20,000,000.00
47483	Maturity	91282CFK2	T 3.500 09/15/2025	100.00000	09/15/2025	09/15/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
58818	Maturity	313385LW4	FHDN 0.000 09/18/2025	100.00000	09/18/2025	09/18/2025	53,200,000.00	53,200,000.00	0.00	53,200,000.00
58819	Maturity	313385LW4	FHDN 0.000 09/18/2025	100.00000	09/18/2025	09/18/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
58464	Maturity	06367DN92	BMOCHG 4.530	100.00000	09/22/2025	09/22/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
58463	Maturity	13606DCV2	CIBCNY 4.530 09/22/2025	100.00000	09/22/2025	09/22/2025	75,000,000.00	75,000,000.00	0.00	75,000,000.00
58826	Maturity	14912DWP0	CATFIN 0.000 09/23/2025	100.00000	09/23/2025	09/23/2025	19,900,000.00	19,900,000.00	0.00	19,900,000.00
46954	Maturity	3137EAEX3	FHLMC 0.375 09/23/2025	100.00000	09/23/2025	09/23/2025	22,600,000.00	22,600,000.00	0.00	22,600,000.00
58594	Maturity	62479LWP6	MUFGBK 0.000 09/23/2025	100.00000	09/23/2025	09/23/2025	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00	0.00	35,000,000.00
58526	Maturity	13606DFF4	CIBCNY 4.420 09/24/2025	100.00000	09/24/2025	09/24/2025	110,000,000.00	110,000,000.00	0.00	110,000,000.00
58385	Full Call	3130B2TG0	FHLB 4.375 09/24/2029	100.00000	09/24/2025	09/24/2025	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	0.00	25,000,000.00
58386	Full Call	3130B2TG0	FHLB 4.375 09/24/2029	100.00000	09/24/2025	09/24/2025	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	0.00	25,000,000.00
58387	Full Call	3130B2TG0	FHLB 4.375 09/24/2029	100.00000	09/24/2025	09/24/2025	65,000,000.00	65,000,000.00	0.00	65,000,000.00
58825	Maturity	14912DWR6	CATFIN 0.000 09/25/2025	100.00000	09/25/2025	09/25/2025	40,000,000.00	40,000,000.00	0.00	40,000,000.00
58830	Maturity	313385MD5	FHDN 0.000 09/25/2025	100.00000	09/25/2025	09/25/2025	52,205,000.00	52,205,000.00	0.00	52,205,000.00
58486	Full Call	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029	100.00000	09/27/2025	09/29/2025	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00	252,250.00	20,252,250.00
58487	Full Call	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029	100.00000	09/27/2025	09/29/2025	62,000,000.00	62,000,000.00	781,975.00	62,781,975.00
58488	Full Call	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029	100.00000	09/27/2025	09/29/2025	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00	252,250.00	20,252,250.00
58489	Full Call	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029	100.00000	09/27/2025	09/29/2025	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00	252,250.00	20,252,250.00
58828	Maturity	14912DWW5	CATFIN 0.000 09/30/2025	100.00000	09/30/2025	09/30/2025	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
47043	Maturity	91282CAM3	T 0.250 09/30/2025	100.00000	09/30/2025	09/30/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
47105	Maturity	91282CAM3	T 0.250 09/30/2025	100.00000	09/30/2025	09/30/2025	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	50,000,000.00
			Activity Total				2,666,355,000.00	2,666,355,000.00	1,538,725.00	2,667,893,725.00

Interest Received Pooled Fund

For month ended September 30, 2025							
Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Date Posted	Interest Received	Purchased Interest Adjustment	Net Interest
58399	Interest Income	91282CFJ5	T 3.125 08/31/2029	09/02/2025	781,250.00		781,250.00
58402	Interest Income	91282CFJ5	T 3.125 08/31/2029	09/02/2025	1,015,625.00		1,015,625.00
58618	Interest Income	91282CGQ8	T 4.000 02/28/2030	09/02/2025	1,000,000.00	222,826.09	777,173.91
58670	Interest Income	91282CKD2	T 4.250 02/28/2029	09/02/2025	1,593,750.00	640,964.67	952,785.33
58671	Interest Income	91282CHX2	T 4.375 08/31/2028	09/02/2025	1,093,750.00	445,822.01	647,927.99
47166	Interest Income	91282CCW9	T 0.750 08/31/2026	09/02/2025	187,500.00		187,500.00
57814	Interest Income	91282CHX2	T 4.375 08/31/2028	09/02/2025	1,093,750.00		1,093,750.00
57903	Interest Income	91282CKD2	T 4.250 02/28/2029	09/02/2025	1,062,500.00		1,062,500.00
47168	Interest Income	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	09/03/2025	134,375.00		134,375.00
47169	Interest Income	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	09/03/2025	134,375.00		134,375.00
47170	Interest Income	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	09/03/2025	134,375.00		134,375.00
47171	Interest Income	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	09/03/2025	134,375.00		134,375.00
58305	Interest Income	3130B2KJ3	FHLB 4.625 09/04/2029	09/04/2025	1,156,250.00		1,156,250.00
58306	Interest Income	3130B2KJ3	FHLB 4.625 09/04/2029	09/04/2025	578,125.00		578,125.00
58307	Interest Income	3130B2KJ3	FHLB 4.625 09/04/2029	09/04/2025	578,125.00		578,125.00
58357	Interest Income	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	09/04/2025	453,125.00		453,125.00
58358	Interest Income	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	09/04/2025	906,250.00		906,250.00
58359	Interest Income	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	09/04/2025	344,375.00		344,375.00
58360	Interest Income	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	09/04/2025	469,437.50		469,437.50
58571	Interest Income	89115DWB8	TDNY 4.360 09/05/2025	09/05/2025	1,017,333.35		1,017,333.35
58446	Interest Income	78015J2Y2	RY 4.550 09/08/2025	09/08/2025	2,439,937.50		2,439,937.50
47314	Interest Income	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	09/08/2025	293,750.00		293,750.00
47315	Interest Income	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	09/08/2025	293,750.00		293,750.00
47316	Interest Income	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	09/08/2025	293,750.00		293,750.00
47317	Interest Income	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	09/08/2025	293,750.00		293,750.00
57906	Interest Income	3130AVBD3	FHLB 4.500 03/09/2029	09/09/2025	562,500.00		562,500.00
58572	Interest Income	89115DWF9	TDNY 4.360 09/10/2025	09/10/2025	1,047,611.10		1,047,611.10
47321	Interest Income	3133ENRD4	FFCB 1.680 03/10/2027	09/10/2025	408,013.20		408,013.20
57815	Interest Income	3133EM4X7	FFCB 0.800 09/10/2026	09/10/2025	115,900.00		115,900.00
57760	Interest Income	3130AXCP1	FHLB 4.875 09/11/2026	09/11/2025	289,940.63		289,940.63
47196	Interest Income	3130A8ZQ9	FHLB 1.750 09/12/2025	09/12/2025	90,081.25		90,081.25
58392	Interest Income	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	09/15/2025	309,375.00		309,375.00
58401	Interest Income	91282CLL3	T 3.375 09/15/2027	09/15/2025	843,750.00		843,750.00
58434	Interest Income	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	09/15/2025	309,375.00		309,375.00
58435	Interest Income	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	09/15/2025	309,375.00		309,375.00
58436	Interest Income	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	09/15/2025	527,793.75		527,793.75
58770	Interest Income	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	09/15/2025	350,625.00	286,343.75	64,281.25
47160	Interest Income	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	09/15/2025	131,250.00		131,250.00
47161	Interest Income	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	09/15/2025	131,250.00		131,250.00
47162	Interest Income	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	09/15/2025	131,250.00		131,250.00
47163	Interest Income	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	09/15/2025	131,250.00		131,250.00
47483	Interest Income	91282CFK2	T 3.500 09/15/2025	09/15/2025	875,000.00		875,000.00
57743	Interest Income	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025	09/15/2025	205,750.00		205,750.00
57744	Interest Income	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025	09/15/2025	375,000.00		375,000.00
57745	Interest Income	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025	09/15/2025	500,000.00		500,000.00
57789	Interest Income	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	09/15/2025	243,750.00		243,750.00
57790	Interest Income	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	09/15/2025	243,750.00		243,750.00
57791	Interest Income	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	09/15/2025	243,750.00		243,750.00

Interest Received Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Date Posted	Interest Received	Purchased Interest Adjustment	Net Interest
57890	Interest Income	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	09/15/2025	895,293.75		895,293.75
57891	Interest Income	3133EP5K7	FFCB 4.500 03/13/2026	09/15/2025	1,125,000.00		1,125,000.00
57900	Interest Income	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	09/15/2025	609,375.00		609,375.00
58064	Interest Income	594918CN2	MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026	09/15/2025	109,684.00		109,684.00
58065	Interest Income	594918CN2	MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026	09/15/2025	221,153.00		221,153.00
58617	Interest Income	3133ER7L9	FFCB 4.000 03/18/2030	09/18/2025	173,900.00	21,254.44	152,645.56
58463	Interest Income	13606DCV2	CIBCNY 4.530 09/22/2025	09/22/2025	2,755,749.98		2,755,749.98
58464	Interest Income	06367DN92	BMOCHG 4.530 09/22/2025	09/22/2025	1,837,166.65		1,837,166.65
57901	Interest Income	3133EP5U5	FFCB 4.125 03/20/2029	09/22/2025	1,065,487.50		1,065,487.50
57905	Interest Income	3133EP5S0	FFCB 4.250 03/20/2028	09/22/2025	105,633.75		105,633.75
46954	Interest Income	3137EAEX3	FHLMC 0.375 09/23/2025	09/23/2025	42,375.00		42,375.00
58385	Interest Income	3130B2TG0	FHLB 4.375 09/24/2029	09/24/2025	546,875.00		546,875.00
58386	Interest Income	3130B2TG0	FHLB 4.375 09/24/2029	09/24/2025	546,875.00		546,875.00
58387	Interest Income	3130B2TG0	FHLB 4.375 09/24/2029	09/24/2025	1,421,875.00		1,421,875.00
58526	Interest Income	13606DFF4	CIBCNY 4.420 09/24/2025	09/24/2025	3,119,783.37		3,119,783.37
57889	Interest Income	3133EP6K6	FFCB 4.500 03/26/2027	09/26/2025	1,125,000.00		1,125,000.00
58486	Interest Income	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029	09/29/2025	252,250.00		252,250.00
58487	Interest Income	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029	09/29/2025	781,975.00		781,975.00
58488	Interest Income	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029	09/29/2025	252,250.00		252,250.00
58489	Interest Income	3136GA3N7	FNMA 5.045 12/27/2029	09/29/2025	252,250.00		252,250.00
47043	Interest Income	91282CAM3	T 0.250 09/30/2025	09/30/2025	62,500.00		62,500.00
47105	Interest Income	91282CAM3	T 0.250 09/30/2025	09/30/2025	62,500.00		62,500.00
47172	Interest Income	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	09/30/2025	218,750.00		218,750.00
47173	Interest Income	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	09/30/2025	218,750.00		218,750.00
47176	Interest Income	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	09/30/2025	218,750.00		218,750.00
47342	Interest Income	91282CEF4	T 2.500 03/31/2027	09/30/2025	312,500.00		312,500.00
Activity Total					44,193,625.28	1,617,210.96	42,576,414.32

Money Market / Secured Bank Deposit Activity

Pooled Fund

For month ended September 30, 2025				
Accounting ID	Description	Activity Date	Transaction Type	Transaction Amount
09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	09/30/2025	Interest Received	48,365.58
	Activity Total			48,365.58
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	09/10/2025	Withdrawal	(50,000,000.00)
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	09/11/2025	Withdrawal	(10,000,000.00)
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	09/12/2025	Deposit	30,000,000.00
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	09/30/2025	Interest Received	2,884,820.09
	Activity Total			(27,115,179.91)
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/03/2025	Withdrawal	(83,000,000.00)
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/04/2025	Withdrawal	(10,000,000.00)
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/05/2025	Deposit	60,000,000.00
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/09/2025	Withdrawal	(55,000,000.00)
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/10/2025	Withdrawal	(100,000,000.00)
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/15/2025	Deposit	150,000,000.00
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/16/2025	Deposit	80,000,000.00
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/17/2025	Withdrawal	(60,000,000.00)
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/18/2025	Deposit	40,000,000.00
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/19/2025	Withdrawal	(15,000,000.00)
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/22/2025	Withdrawal	(80,000,000.00)
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/23/2025	Deposit	15,000,000.00
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/24/2025	Deposit	55,000,000.00
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/25/2025	Deposit	35,000,000.00
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/26/2025	Withdrawal	(5,000,000.00)
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/29/2025	Deposit	85,000,000.00
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/30/2025	Deposit	10,000,000.00
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations	09/30/2025	Interest Received	563,527.57
	Activity Total			122,563,527.57
262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash	09/30/2025	Interest Received	50,771.94
	Activity Total			50,771.94
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	09/02/2025	Withdrawal	(105,000,000.00)
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	09/08/2025	Withdrawal	(5,000,000.00)
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	09/15/2025	Deposit	75,000,000.00
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	09/17/2025	Withdrawal	(75,000,000.00)
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt	09/30/2025	Interest Received	78,827.23
	Activity Total			(109,921,172.77)
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity	09/30/2025	Interest Received	46,080.66
	Activity Total			46,080.66
0660P0999	Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct	09/30/2025	Interest Received	1,258,854.87
	Activity Total			1,258,854.87

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 October 9
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 11:45:00 AM
Attachments: [ISCOTT_1602_Minutes.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the SFMTA, submitting meeting minutes for the October 8, 2025, ISCOTT public hearing.

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, October 9, 2025 10:58 AM
To: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Subject: Minutes of the ISCOTT Hearing on October 9

Good morning –

Attached are the minutes of the October 9, 2025, 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



ISCOTT MINUTES

INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE
ON TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION FOR
TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES

Meeting of October 9, 2025 - Thursday, 9:00 AM
1602nd Regular Meeting
Online Meeting

COMMITTEE	REPRESENTATIVE
SFMTA	Bryant Woo (Chair)
SFPD	Sgt. Eric Elias, Sgt. Dion McDonnell, Off. Jim Pandolfi, Off. Ronald Quock
SFFD	Lt. Erin Yamamura, Insp. Jared Franklin
Public Health	Aron Wong
Public Works	Jomari Fernandez
Entertainment Commission	May Liang
Planning	Absent

DEPARTMENTS	REPRESENTATIVE
SFMTA Special Events	Nick Chapman, Dianne Yee
SFMTA Transit	Leslie Bienenfeld, Helen Kwan
SFMTA Enforcement	James Sarracino
SFMTA Temporary Signs	Houston Forrester, Bradley Wilkinson, Gary Chau, Sean Muneno
SFMTA Taxis	Scott Leon
Emergency Management	Leo Ishoda

GUESTS	ITEM	GUESTS	ITEM
Peter M. Bransten		Leela Bransten	
Kyle Petersen		Whitney Sher	
Sergio Valdes		Roz Arbel	
Kerry Engler		Kemmeter, Ellie	
Jim Weber		Will Faulkner	
Kevin Pool		Colleen Chase	
Michele Scarani		Christine	
Nick Moser		Kieran	
Freya Blount		Del Rosario, Mick (BOS)	
Heard, Paige		Iverson, Betsy	



Rose Z.		Christine Crosby	
Barry Taranto		Michelle Delaney	
Chris Carrington		Marcus	
Liza Bernard		Daniel Strickland	
Victoria Narkewicz		eliotte durham	
Ian		Andrea Ferrucci EAG	
Angie Petitt-Sunset Mercantile		Santi, Manchanda (Warriors)	
ayush Aggarwal		Lian Ladia (CAMP)	
Maggie Weis		Yoyo Murphy (Warriors)	
Leela Bransten			



MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 25, 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.** Clarion Alley between Valencia and Mission streets
Sunday, November 2, 2025, 12 pm to 9 pm
Clarion Alley Block Party
- B.** Levant Street between States Street and Lower Terrace
Sunday, December 7, 2025, 9 am to 5 pm
Block Party - 4th Annual Levant Street
- C.** De Haro Street between 23rd and 24th streets
Saturday, December 13, 2025, 2 pm to 10 pm
Block Party - De Haro Street Holiday
- D.** Alvarado Street between Noe and Sanchez streets
Sunday, October 19, 2025, 9 am to 4 pm
Block Party – 400 Block Alvarado Street
- E.** Mirabel Avenue between Coso Avenue and Shotwell Street
Saturday, October 25, 2025, 9 am to 5:30 pm
Block Party – Mirabel Avenue
- F.** Anderson Street between Tompkins and Ogden avenues
Saturday, November 1, 2025, 3 pm to 9 pm
Block Party - Anderson Street
- G.** Randall Street between Whitney and Sanchez streets
Friday, October 31, 2025, 4 pm to 10 pm
Trick or Treat - Randall St



- H.** Otsego Avenue between Santa Ynez and Santa Ysabel avenues
(Intersections to remain open)
Friday, October 31, 2025, 5 pm to 10 pm
Trick or Treat - Otsego Ave
- I.** Avila Street between Chestnut and Prado streets
Intersections closed: Alhambra, Capra and Beach streets at Avila Street
Friday, October 31, 2025, 4 pm to 9 pm
Treat or Treat - Avila St
- J.** Tennessee Street between 19th and 20th streets
Friday, October 31, 2025, 7 am to 12 noon
La Scuola Halloween Celebration
- K.** Quintara Street between 10th Avenue and Easterly Terminus
Sunday, November 2, 2025, 11 am to 6 pm
Block Party – Quintara and 10th
- L.** Ulloa Street between Waithman Way and Laguna Honda Blvd
Friday, December 5, 2025, 3 pm to 11 pm
 and
Saturday, December 6, 2025, 9 am to 11 pm
St. Brendan Parish School Christmas Boutique and Carnival
- M.** Minna Street between 2nd and New Montgomery streets
Monday, January 12, 2026, 6 am to
Wednesday, January 14, 2026, 11:59 pm
111 Minna – JP Morgan Conference Events

APPROVED (6-0)

REGULAR CALENDAR

- N.** Riverton Drive between Sloat Boulevard and Ocean Avenue
Sunday, October 19, 2025, 10 am to 4 pm
Block Party - Riverton Dr

APPROVED (6-0)



- O. 36th Avenue between Quintara and Rivera streets
Friday, October 31, 2025, 3 pm to 9 pm
Block Party - 36th Ave Trick or Treat Birthday

APPROVED (6-0)

- P. Lake Street between 6th and 7th avenues
Friday, October 31, 2025, 3:30 pm to 9 pm
Trick or Treat - Slow Lake Halloween!

APPROVED (6-0)

- Q. 28th Avenue between Lincoln Way and Irving Street
Friday, October 31, 2025, 5 pm to 10 pm
Trick-or-Treat - 28th Ave

ON HOLD

- R. 42nd Avenue between Lincoln Way to Irving Street
Friday, October 31, 2025, 5 pm to 9 pm
Trick or Treat - 42nd Ave

APPROVED (6-0)

- S. Belvedere Street between 17th Street and Parnassus Avenue
Intersections closed: Belvedere Street at Rivoli, Alma, and Grattan streets
Friday, October 31, 2025, 4 pm to 10 pm
Trick or Treat – Belvedere

APPROVED (6-0)

- T. Mason Street between Sacramento and California streets
Saturday, November 22, 2025, 1 pm to 4 pm
Wedding Baraat Procession

APPROVED (6-0)



- U.** Marin Street between Illinois Street and Easterly Terminus; Michigan Street between Cesar Chavez and Marin Street
Intersection closed: Michigan Street at Marin Street
(Local access allowed on Michigan Street via Cesar Chavez and Marin Street via Illinois)

Friday, October 24, 2025, 12:01 am to

Sunday, October 26, 2025, 6 am

Midway – Metro Boomin

and

Friday, November 21, 2025, 12:01 am to

Monday, November 24, 2025, 6 am

Midway – Knock 2

APPROVED (6-0)

- V.** Burrows Street between San Bruno Avenue and easterly terminus

Friday, October 31, 2025, 8 am to 9 pm

Spooky Garden Reverie

APPROVED (6-0)

- W.** Maiden Lane between Stockton Street and Grant Avenue

Thursday, November 13, 2025, 6 pm to 9 pm

Steelcase Showroom Opening

APPROVED (6-0)

- X.** Green Street between Powell Street and Columbus Ave/Stockton Street

Saturday, November 15, 2025, 2 pm to 11 pm

Brit Event - Dear, San Francisco

APPROVED (6-0)

- Y.** 20th Street between Illinois and Georgia streets

Monday, December 1, 2025, 5 am to 8 pm

and

Wednesday, December 3, 2025, 5 am to 8 pm

Fall '25 Demo Day

APPROVED (6-0)



- Z.** Kaplan Lane between Clementina Street and northerly terminus
Monday, October 13, 2025, 6 am to
Thursday, October 16, 2025, 6 pm
Deloitte Dreamforce Activation

APPROVED (6-0)

- AA.** 18th Street between Noe and Diamond streets; Eureka Lot (4116 – 18th Street)
(Intersections of 18th Street at Hartford, Castro, and Collinwood streets to remain open.)
Friday, October 31, 2025, 11 am to 11:59 pm
Castro Night Market October – Halloween

APPROVED (6-0)

- BB.** Natoma Street between New Montgomery and Howard streets
Friday, November 14, 2025, 2 pm to 11:59 pm
SFMOMA Member Party

APPROVED (6-0)

- CC.** Front Street between California and Sacramento streets; Halleck Street between Battery and Front streets
Friday, October 31, 2025, 12 noon to
Saturday, November 1, 2025, 1 am
Nightmare on Front Street

APPROVED (6-0)

- DD.** Cole Street between Frederick Street and Parnassus Avenue
(Intersection of Cole at Carl Street to remain open.)
Thursday, November 20, 2025, 12 pm to 11:59 pm
Cole Valley Nights

APPROVED (6-0)



- EE.** Terry A Francois Blvd between Warriors Way and 16th Street
Tuesday, November 18, 2025, 10 am to 2 pm
and
Wednesday, November 18, 2025, 9 am to 12 noon
Microsoft Ignite 2025 (Chase Center)

APPROVED (6-0)

- FF.** Oak Street between Stanyan and Broderick streets; Fell Street between Stanyan and Broderick streets; Baker Street between Hayes and Page streets; Masonic Avenue between Hayes and Haight streets; Stanyan Street between Hayes and Haight streets; Kezar Drive between Lincoln Way and Stanyan Street
Intersections closed: Shrader, Cole, Clayton, and Ashbury, Central, Lyon, and Baker at Oak and Fell Streets; Masonic and Stanyan at Page, Oak and Fell streets
Sunday, February 1, 2026, 7:15 am to 10 am
and
Great Highway between Sloat Blvd and Fulton Street
Sunday, February 1, 2026, 6 am to 12 Noon
San Francisco Half Marathon

APPROVED (6-0)

- GG.** Stockton Street between Post and O'Farrell streets; Maiden Lane from Grant Avenue and Stockton Street
Intersection closed: Maiden Lane at Stockton Street
(Intersection of Stockton and Geary streets will remain open at all times)
Tuesday, December 9, 2025, 4 am to
Saturday, December 27, 2025, 10 pm
Winter Walk

APPROVED (6-0)

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.

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 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 \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: ISCOTT Hearing on Thu, October 23 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 10:26:16 AM
Attachments: [ISCOTT_1603_Agenda.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached, from the San Francisco Municipal Transit Agency (SFMTA), submitting the meeting agenda for the October 23, 2025, Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT) meeting.

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: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2025 9:05 AM
To: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Subject: ISCOTT Hearing on Thu, October 23 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests

Good morning –

Attached is the agenda for the upcoming ISCOTT hearing on Thursday, October 23.

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 October 23, 2025 - Thursday, 9:00 AM
1603rd Regular Meeting

Online Participation

Please join Microsoft Teams Meeting at
[SFMTA.com/ISCOTTHearing](https://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 OCTOBER 9, 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.** Anderson Street between Jarboe and Tomkins avenues
 Saturday, November 1, 2025, 1 pm to 9 pm
 Block Party - 400 Anderson Street

- B.** 28th Ave between Lincoln Way and Irving Street
 Friday, October 31, 2025, 4 pm to 10 pm
 Trick-or-Treat - 28th Ave

- C.** Jefferson Street between Hyde Street and westerly terminus
 Saturday, August 8, 2025, 1 am to 2 pm
 Alcatraz Sharkfest Swim 2025

REGULAR CALENDAR

- D.** Shotwell Street between 21st and 22nd streets
 Friday, October 31, 2025, 1:30 pm to 10 pm
 Trick-or-Treat - Shotwell 2025

- E.** 12th Avenue between Lincoln Way and Irving Street
 Friday, October 31, 2025, 3 pm to 9 pm
 Trick-or-Treat - 12th Ave



- F.** O'Farrell Street between Steiner and Fillmore streets
Saturday, January 3, 2026, through
Saturday, December 26, 2026
7 am to 3 pm **each Saturday**
Fillmore Farmers' Market
- G.** 1325 9th Ave/Irving Lot between 8th and 9th Avenues
Sunday, January 4, 2026, through
Sunday, December 27, 2026
7 am to 3 pm **each Sunday**
Inner Sunset Farmers' Market
- H.** Noe Street between Market and Beaver streets
Wednesday, April 1, 2026, through
Wednesday, November 18, 2026
1 pm to 8:30 pm **each Wednesday**
Castro Farmers' Market
- I.** Lincoln Way between La Playa and Great Highway
Sunday, January 11, 2026, 7 am to 10:30 am
Hot Chocolate Run
- J.** Vermont Street between 20th and 22nd streets
Sunday, April 5, 2026, 9 am to 9 pm
Bring Your Own Big Wheel
- K.** Irving Street between 22nd and 25th avenues; 23rd Avenue between Judah Street and Lincoln Way (Muni and local access only); 24th Avenue between Judah Street and Lincoln Way
Intersection closed: Irving Street at 24th Avenue
Friday, December 12, 2025, 12 pm to 11:59 pm
Sunset Holiday Night Bazaar
- L.** 23rd Street between Bryant and York streets
Saturday, December 13, 2025, 9 am to 7 pm
TPPC en el Barrio
- M.** Grove Street between Polk and Larkin streets
Friday, November 7, 2025, 7 am to
Saturday, November 8, 2025, 3 am
BGCA - DoeChii - Live From the Swamp



- N.** Utah Street between 16th and Alameda streets; 15th Street between Potrero Avenue and Vermont Street; Alameda Street between Potrero Avenue and Vermont Street; San Bruno Avenue between 16th and Alameda streets
Tuesday, December 30, 2025, 5 pm to
Friday, January 2, 2026, 9 am
Great Northern - Breakfast of Champions/It's a New Day
- O.** Front Street between California and Sacramento streets; Halleck Street between Front and Battery streets
Thursday, November 6, 2025, 11 am to
Friday, November 7, 2025, 1:30 am
Urban Land Institute Conference Closing Party
- P.** Carl Street between Cole and Clayton streets
Tuesday, November 18, 2025, 8 am to
Friday, November 21, 2025, 8 pm
and
Carl Street between Shrader and Cole streets (Muni and local access only)
Intersection closed: Cole Street at Carl Street (Muni only)
Thursday, November 20, 2025, 12 noon to 11:59 pm
Cole Valley Pop-Up Town Square

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
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Date

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.

Q. Elm Street between Van Ness Avenue and Polk Street

Thursday, December 4, 2025, through

Friday, December 4, 2026

8 am to 4 pm, Monday through Friday

Elm St – School Street

R. Hayes Street between Gough and Octavia streets

Friday, November 28, 2025, through

Saturday, November 28, 2026

4 pm to 10 pm, each Friday

10 am to 10 pm, each Saturday

10 am to 10 pm, each Sunday

HVNA – 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.

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: State Legislation Committee Minutes Oct 15 2025
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 10:15:15 AM
Attachments: [State Legislation Committee Oct 15 2025.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached minutes of the October 15, 2025 meeting of the State Legislation Committee.

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.*



STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 15th, 2025
9:00am -10:00am
City Hall, Room 288

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 OCT 16 AM 09:52

RZ

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 114 6058
- **Meeting Password:** epNpAmsB233
- **Join by Phone at:** +1-415-655-0001 United States Toll (San Francisco) (Please dial “#” after entering the Meeting ID to view the meeting)
- **Link:**
<https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m286a50f54bf0162cf9520f6d0843441d>
- **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 -- Sophie Marie
Assessor's Office -- Holly Lung
City Attorney's Office -- Luis Zamora
Controller's Office -- Greyson Spencer
Treasurer's Office -- Eric Manke

Meeting commenced at 9:05am.

AGENDA

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Eileen Mariano, Frances Hsieh, Sophie Marie, Holly Lung, Luis Zamora, Greyson Spencer

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item). Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting on August 27th, 2025.

Motion to approve: Luis Zamora
Seconded by: Frances Hsieh
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. **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.
- V. **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 9:25am.

Disability Access

Room 288 of City Hall is located at 1 Dr. Carlton 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=m286a50f54bf0162cf9520f6d0843441d>
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 United States Toll (San Francisco)
 - **Webinar ID:** 2661 114 6058
 - **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: October 06, 2025 SFAC Full Commission Agenda Posted
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 10:42:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[October 6 2025 Draft Agenda - Full Commission Meeting 2.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Arts Commission, submitting an agenda for the October 6, 2025, Full Commission 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: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART) <manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 2, 2025 6:32 PM
Subject: October 06, 2025 SFAC Full Commission Agenda Posted

Hello,

The agenda for the Monday, October 06, 2025, Full Commission meeting has been posted:

[Full Arts Commission Meeting | San Francisco \(sf.gov\)](#)

[Agenda](#)

Thank you,
Manraj



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

San Francisco Arts Commission

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

www.sfartscommission.org

[Newsletter](#) | [Flickr](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#) | [TikTok](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#)

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

Please be mindful that all correspondence and documents submitted to the San Francisco Arts Commission are public records and, as such, are subject to the [Sunshine Ordinance](#) and can be requested by the public. If this happens, personal information such as personal emails, Social Security numbers and phone numbers will be redacted.



MEETING OF THE FULL ARTS COMMISSION

**Monday, October 6, 2025
2 p.m.
City Hall, Room 416
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place**

Agenda

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

2. Approval of Minutes

Discussion and Possible Action

Discussion and possible action to approve [September 5, 2025, Draft Minutes](#)

Presentation Time: Approximately 5 minutes

Explanatory Document: [September 5, 2025, Draft Minutes](#)

3. General Public Comment

Discussion

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

4. Director's Report

Discussion

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

Staff Presenter: Director of Cultural Affairs Ralph Remington



Presentation Time: Approximately 10 minutes

5. Committee Reports and Committee Matters

1. Civic Design Committee – Debra Walker, Chair

1. Civic Design Committee Report *Discussion*

Presentation Time: Approximately 10 minutes

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

2. Visual Arts Committee – Suzie Ferras, Chair

1. Visual Arts Committee Report *Discussion*

Presentation Time: Approximately 10 minutes

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

3. Executive Committee – Chuck Collins, Chair

1. Executive Committee Report *Discussion*

Presentation Time: Approximately 5 minutes

Report from the Executive Committee regarding activities of the Committee and the Program.

6. Consent Calendar

Discussion and possible action

Presentation Time: Approximately 5 minutes

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

1. Motion to approve the August 26, 2025, [Community Investments Committee Meeting Minutes](#).
2. Motion to approve the September 15, 2025, [Civic Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes](#).
3. Motion to approve the September 30, 2025, [Visual Arts Committee Meeting Minutes](#).
4. Motion to approve the September 24, 2025, [Executive Committee Meeting Minutes](#).

Civic Design Review Committee Recommendations (September 15, 2025, [link to agenda](#)) ***Action***

5. Motion to approve Small Project Review for Powell Street Improvements.
6. Motion to approve Phase 1 Review for Ingleside Police Station Replacement.
7. Motion to approve Conceptual/Phase 1 Review for SFO West Utilities and Paving Project (Station BP)

Visual Arts Committee Recommendations (September 30, 2025, [link to agenda](#)) ***Action***

8. Motion to approve a sole source contract with Certified Tile and Stone, Inc. for fine art installation services for the Mission Bay School Public Art Project pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 6.73, in an amount not to exceed \$31,756. The contractor's specialized qualifications, proprietary knowledge of the artwork and project site, and proven expertise in fine art handling make these

services not reasonably available from another provider without risk of duplicative costs, delays, or potential damage to the artworks.

9. Motion to approve a sole source contract with One Hat One Hand LLC for fine art installation services for the Pier 27 James R. Herman Cruise Terminal Plaza Public Art Project, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 6.73, in an amount not to exceed \$20,473.75. The contractor's specialized qualifications, proprietary knowledge of the artworks, and proven expertise in fine art handling make these services not reasonably available from another provider without risk of duplicative costs, delays, or potential damage to the artworks.
10. Motion to approve final design of bust including clay model of Ed Lee bust and final design of plaque on pedestal, including layout of text, material and attachment method for installation in City Hall.
11. Motion to approve the conceptual design proposal by Tomashi Jackson for the Terminal 3 West C4C FIS East Art Wall Public Art Project, as recommended by the Artist Review Panel.
12. Motion to authorize the Director of Cultural Affairs to enter into a contract with Tomashi Jackson for an amount not to exceed \$400,000 for the design, fabrication, insurance, and consultation during installation of a tile and glass mosaic artwork for the Terminal 3 West C4C FIS East Art Wall Public Art Project.
13. Motion to approve the conceptual design proposal *From Bridge to Bridge and Our Life in Between* by Muzae Sesay for the Terminal 3 West C4C FIS West Art Wall Public Art Project, as recommended by the Artist Review Panel.
14. Motion to authorize the Director of Cultural Affairs to enter into a contract with Muzae Sesay for an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the design, fabrication, insurance, and consultation during installation of a mosaic tile artwork for the Terminal 3 West C4C FIS West Art Wall Public Art Project.

15. Motion to approve the final design of an artwork by Maria Belen Islas Cuellar (Belen Islas), in collaboration with the Association of the Ramaytush Ohlone, for the San Francisco Main Library Temporary Atrium Mural Project.

**Executive Committee Recommendations (September 24, 2025,
[link to agenda](#))**

Action

16. Motion to approve an allocation of up to \$550,000 from the Public Art Trust's Undesignated Funds to commission a new permanent artwork celebrating Filipino culture and identity in the Filipino Cultural Heritage District.

7. Vaillancourt Fountain

Discussion

Staff Presenter: Mary Chou, Director of Public Art Program and Civic Art Collection

Presentation time: Approximately 15 minutes

The presentation will include an overview of the history of Vaillancourt Fountain, recent findings on the Fountain as part of the Embarcadero Plaza and Sue Bierman Park Renovation Project, and recent actions taken by the City in response to these reports.

Explanatory Document:

[\(1\) 2025.03.06 Embarcadero Plaza and Sue Bierman Park Renovation Project Community Meeting 1](#)

[\(2\) 2025-05-15 Vaillancourt Fountain HRR](#)

[\(3\) 24146A 2025-06-02 Vaillancourt Fountain Conditions Assessment Final](#)

[\(4\) Embarcadero Plaza Accessibility Assessment Final 20250707](#)

[\(5\) 2025.07.08 Embarcadero Plaza and Sue Bierman Park Renovation Project Community Meeting 2](#)

[\(6\)FINAL 8.18.25 -RPD letter to Arts - Vaillancourt Fountain.docx](#)

[\(7\)Cost estimates for fountain](#)

[\(8\) 251006 StaffReport Vaillancourt](#)

8. New Business and Announcements

Discussion

(This item is to allow the Commissioners to introduce without discussion new agenda items for consideration, to report on recent arts activities and to make announcements in accordance with [Prop D.](#))

8. Adjournment

Action

Agenda posted 10/02/2025 4:33 p.m., md

Notices

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

Agenda Item Information / Materials Available

Each item on the agenda may include the following documents:

- 1) Department or Agency or report;
- 2) Public correspondence;
- 3) Other explanatory documents.

Explanatory documents listed above, as well as documents created or distributed after the posting of this agenda to the Arts Commission will be available only electronically, please contact: Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal at manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org or 415-252-2247. PLEASE NOTE: The Arts Commission often receives documents created or submitted by other City officials, agencies or departments after the posting of the Arts



Commission agenda. For such documents or presentations, members of the public may wish to contact the originating agency if they seek documents not yet provided to the Arts Commission.

Meeting Procedures

1. Agenda items will normally be heard in order. Please note, that on occasion a special circumstance may necessitate that an agenda item be taken out of order. To ensure that an agenda item is not missed, it is advised to arrive at the beginning of the meeting. All agenda changes will be announced by the Chair at the top of the meeting.
2. Public comment will be taken before or during the Committee's consideration of each agenda item. Each speaker will be allowed to speak for the time allotted by the Chair at the top of the meeting or up to three (3) minutes.
3. During General Public Comment, members of the public may address the Commissioners on matters that are within the Arts Commission's jurisdiction and are not on the agenda.
4. Persons who spoke during the public comment period at a meeting of the Arts Commission may supply a brief written summary of the comments to be included in the minutes if it is 150 words or less. The Arts Commission may reject the summary if it exceeds the prescribed word limit or is not an accurate summary of the speaker's public comment.
5. Persons unable to attend an Arts Commission meeting may submit correspondence to the Arts Commission in connection with an agenda item. The Commission Secretary will post these documents adjacent to the agenda if they are one page in length. If they are longer than one page, the Arts Commission will make such documents available for public inspection and copying. Please note, correspondence submitted to the Arts Commission will NOT be read aloud during the meeting. Names and addresses included in these submittals will be public. Submittals may be made anonymously. Written comments pertaining to this meeting should be submitted to art-info@sfgov.org.

Electronic Devices Prohibited

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing



electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting, except as necessary to participate remotely. The Chair may order the exclusion from participation of any person responsible for improper disruptions to this remote meeting.

Disability Access

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

Archives Available

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

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

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

Sunshine Ordinance

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

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

Accessibility Meeting Policy

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

利便參與會議的相關規定

根據美國殘疾人士法案和語言服務條例，中文、西班牙語、和/或美國手語翻譯人員在收到要求後將會提供翻譯服務。另外，我們將盡力提供擴音設備。同時也將會提供不同格式的會議資料，和/或者提供閱讀器。此外，翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會通過後提供。上述的要求，請於會議前最少48小時致電415-252-2247向 Manraj Dhaliwal, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org 提出。逾期提出的請求，若可能的話，亦會被考慮接納。聽證室設有輪椅通道。

POLITICA DE ACCESO A LA REUNIÓN

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

Patakaran para sa pag-access ng mga Miting

Ayon sa batas ng American Disabilities Act at ng Language Access Ordinance, maaring mag-request ng mga tagapagsalin wika sa salitang Tsino, Espanyol at/o sa may kapansanan pandinig sa American Sign Language. Bukod pa dito, sisikapin gawan ng paraan na makapaglaan ng



gamit upang lalong pabutihin ang inyong pakikinig, maibahagi ang mga kaganapan ng miting sa iba't ibang anyo, at/o isang tagapagbasa. Ang mga kaganapan ng miting ay maaring isalin sa ibang wika matapos ito ay aprobahan ng komisyon. Sa mga ganitong uri ng kahilingan, mangyari po lamang makipag ugnayan kay Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal sa 415-252-2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Magbigay po lamang ng hindi bababa sa 48 oras na abiso bago ng miting. Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng tanggapin. Ang silid ng pagpupulungan ay accessible sa mga naka wheelchair.

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: October 20, 2025 SFAC Civic Design Review Agenda Posted
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 3:21:12 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hello,

Please see below link to the San Francisco Arts Commission (ART) Civic Design Review committee meeting agenda for October 20, 2025.

Regards,

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

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

From: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART) <manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 2:52 PM
Subject: October 20, 2025 SFAC Civic Design Review Agenda Posted

Hello,

The agenda for the Monday, October 20, 2025, Civic Design Review meeting has been posted:

[Civic Design Review Meeting | San Francisco \(sf.gov\)](#)

Agenda

Thank you,
Manraj



Manraj Dhaliwal

Commission Secretary

Pronouns: [he/him](#)

Email: manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org

Phone: 415-252-2247

Mobile: 415-940-1803

San Francisco Arts Commission

401 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 325

San Francisco, CA 94102

www.sfartscommission.org

[Newsletter](#) | [Flickr](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#) | [TikTok](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#)

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

Please be mindful that all correspondence and documents submitted to the San Francisco Arts Commission are public records and, as such, are subject to the [Sunshine Ordinance](#) and can be requested by the public. If this happens, personal information such as personal emails, Social Security numbers and phone numbers will be redacted.

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: September 30, 2025 Visual Arts Committee Agenda
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 10:42:00 AM
Attachments: [Outlook-Logo_Desc.png](#)
[VAC Minutes_9.30.25.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Arts Commission, submitting draft minutes for the September 30, 2025, Visual Arts Committee.

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: Cotz, Paris (ART) <paris.cotz@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:58 PM
Cc: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART) <manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org>; Peterson, Tara (ART) <tara.peterson@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: September 30, 2025 Visual Arts Committee Agenda

Hello,

Please find the September 30 2025 Visual Arts Committee draft minutes here: <https://www.sf.gov/meeting--september-17-2025--visual-arts-committee-meeting> and attached.

Thank you,
Paris



Paris Cotz
Program Associate, Public Art
Pronouns: [she/her](#)
Email: paris.cotz@sfgov.org
Mobile: 415-539-6213

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.

From: Cotz, Paris (ART) <paris.cotz@sfgov.org>

Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2025 11:41 AM

Cc: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART) <manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org>; Peterson, Tara (ART) <tara.peterson@sfgov.org>

Subject: Re: September 30, 2025 Visual Arts Committee Agenda

Hello,

Please find the amended agenda for the Visual Arts Committee Meeting coming up on Tuesday, September 30, 2025 attached via PDF and here: <https://www.sf.gov/meeting--september-17-2025--visual-arts-committee-meeting>

Thank you,
Paris



Paris Cotz

Program Associate, Public Art

Pronouns: [she/her](#)

Email: paris.cotz@sfgov.org

Mobile: 415-539-6213

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.

From: Cotz, Paris (ART) <paris.cotz@sfgov.org>

Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 2:01 PM

Cc: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART) <manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org>; Peterson, Tara (ART) <tara.peterson@sfgov.org>

Subject: September 30, 2025 Visual Arts Committee Agenda

Hello,

Please find the agenda for the Visual Arts Committee Meeting coming up on Tuesday, September 30, 2025 attached via PDF and here: <https://www.sf.gov/meeting--september-17-2025--visual-arts-committee-meeting>

Thank you,

Paris



Paris Cotz

Program Associate, Public Art

Pronouns: [she/her](#)

Email: paris.cotz@sfgov.org

Mobile: 415-539-6213

San Francisco Arts Commission

401 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 325

San Francisco, CA 94102

www.sfartscommission.org

[Newsletter](#) | [Flickr](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#) | [TikTok](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#)

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

contemporary indigenous voices and culture.

Please be mindful that all correspondence and documents submitted to the San Francisco Arts Commission are public records and, as such, are subject to the [Sunshine Ordinance](#) and can be requested by the public. If this happens, personal information such as personal emails, Social Security numbers and phone numbers will be redacted.

MEETING OF THE VISUAL ARTS COMMITTEE

Tuesday, September 30, 2025

2:00 p.m.

Hybrid Meeting

Draft Minutes

Chair Ferras called the meeting to order at 2:09pm.

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

Commissioners Present:

Janine Shiota, Vice President

Nabiel Musleh

Marcus Anthony Shelby

Debra Walker

Commissioners Absent:

Suzie Ferras

JD Beltran

SFAC staff in attendance: Public Art Program and Civic Art Collection Director Mary Chou, Deputy Director of Programs Ebon Glenn and Director of Cultural Affairs Ralph Remington (arrived at 2:13pm).

2. General Public Comment

(06:09)

Public Comment

Richard Rothman raised concerns about the lack of maintenance for historic murals on Recreation and Park buildings, specifically at Coit Tower and the Mother's Building at the San Francisco Zoo. He emphasized that preserving these murals was crucial - painted by women artists and using egg tempera. Rothman noted the Mother's Building has been closed since

2000 and may face structural failure without restoration, which could cost around \$20 million. He urged the Arts Commission to be more involved and to have a more active role in preserving these murals.

Susie McKinnon from the Mid-Market Community Benefit District announced the upcoming "2 Blocks of Art" event on October 11. The theme, "Sight and Sound," will include over 20 activations across vacant storefronts, museums, and historic buildings from 5th to 7th Street, aiming to bring vitality and opportunities for artists and neighbors alike.

Written Public Comment

Jack McCarthy, Board Member of Docomomo US/Northern California

"I'm a SF resident and a board member of DOCOMOMO US/Northern California. We are dedicated to highlighting and preserving Modern buildings and sites. Our broad coalition submitted a letter advocating for the preservation of Embarcadero Plaza and the Vaillancourt Fountain.

Today, we're here to address two key procedural issues. **First**, the Arts Commission's bylaws require a Landscape Architect, but this seat is vacant. We request this position be filled before any action is taken on the fountain, as its history is deeply tied to landscape architecture. **Second**, the fountain appears to be bypassing established deaccessioning procedures by going directly to the Full Commission. We ask for clarification on the process and a commitment to following the correct procedures to ensure transparency and public engagement. Thank you"

Tad Sky, a Street Artist since the late 1970s, voiced concern over the Commission Streamlining Task Force's proposal to combine or eliminate the Arts Commission. He also shared his personal experience with Vaillancourt Fountain, and how when it was working, it was spectacular. He believes that it is a site-specific artwork, but once the freeway came down and it started to breakdown, it became an eyesore and it won't fit into the newly proposed waterfront park.

Matt Joseph criticized past and current handling of the Vaillancourt Fountain and Embarcadero Plaza. He highlighted several failed projects and warned against repeating mistakes driven by biases and rushed commitments. He reminded Commissioners of past projects at Embarcadero Plaza that have been not as successful. Joseph called on the Commission to request an unabridged historical account of the plaza and fountain, including renovations, prior designs, and relevant artifacts, and a full public briefing on the application of the California Art Preservation Act, and whether gross negligence in maintenance occurred.

3. Consent Calendar (20:56)

1. Motion to approve a sole source contract with Certified Tile and Stone, Inc. for fine art installation services for the Mission Bay School Public Art Project pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 6.73, in an amount not to exceed \$31,756. The contractor's specialized qualifications, proprietary knowledge of the artwork and project site, and proven expertise in fine art handling make these services not reasonably available from another provider without risk of duplicative costs, delays, or potential damage to the artworks.
2. Motion to approve a sole source contract with One Hat One Hand LLC for fine art installation services for the Pier 27 James R. Herman Cruise Terminal Plaza Public Art Project, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 6.73, in an amount not to exceed \$20,473.75. The contractor's specialized qualifications, proprietary knowledge of the artworks, and proven expertise in fine art handling make these services not reasonably available from another provider without risk of duplicative costs, delays, or potential damage to the artworks.

There was no public comment.

Moved: Walker/Musleh

The motion unanimously carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Musleh, Shelby, Shiota, Walker

4. Gift of Mayor Ed Lee Bust

(24:01)

Art consultant Dorka Keehn presented the final wax designs of the bust honoring the late Mayor Ed Lee. The bust is created by sculptor Jonah Hendrickson, who also created the bust of former Mayor Gavin Newsom at City Hall and the Mayor Lee sculpture at Chase Center. The bust is the same size and scale as former Mayor James Phelan's bust, which it will be replacing, and is intended to reflect Lee's legacy as a "man of the people." Lee's family was actively involved in the review process and approved the bust design. The bust will be installed at the entrance of San Francisco City Hall.

In addition to the sculpture, a plaque will be affixed to the pedestal featuring a quote chosen by the family, which will also be translated into Chinese. The plaque will be made of sandstone to match the current pedestal material and will be hand engraved by a local stone engraver. It will be attached using concealed pins and epoxy for a seamless look.

There was no public comment.

Motion to approve final design of bust including clay model of Ed Lee bust and final design of plaque on pedestal, including layout of text, material and attachment method for installation in City Hall.

Moved: Walker/Shelby

The motion unanimously carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Musleh, Shelby, Shiota, Walker

5. San Francisco International Airport Terminal 3 West Modernization Courtyard 4 Connector

(29:29)

The Terminal 3 West Modernization Project (T3 West) consists of the renovation and expansion of the west portion and connector to the F concourse of the Terminal 3 facility. The overall goals of the project are to make the passenger journey between Terminal 3 and the International Terminal Building more efficient and comfortable, to provide essential operational office space for tenants, and to offer expanded airline lounge space for passengers.

The design concept of the T3 West Modernization project is “A Day in the Life of San Francisco,” which reflects the rich culture, food, art, life, and geography one would encounter while walking the Crosstown trail in a single day. The Courtyard 4 Connector (C4C) building is a new six-story building that acts as a spatial link between the international terminal and T3 West, while incorporating a mix of passenger and tenant functions.

For the East Wall of the Federal Inspective Services (FIS) corridor, the artist review panel selected Tomashi Jackson, a multimedia artist known for her research-driven practice. Jackson’s proposal involves creating a vibrant, site-specific mural that reflects the joy and diversity of San Francisco. She plans to incorporate archival and original photographs of locals celebrating, playing, and dancing, along with materials like secondhand clothing and soil from significant City sites. These elements will be layered into a painted and collaged image, which will be translated into durable tile and glass mosaic. The work aims to offer a welcoming and festive corridor to travelers passing through.

For the West Wall of the FIS corridor, Muzae Sesay was recommended by the panel. His mural, *From Bridge to Bridge and Our Life In Between*, is a colorful, energetic tribute to San Francisco’s landscape and spirit. The artwork follows a day in the city, moving from sunrise over the Bay Bridge to nightfall at the Golden Gate Bridge. Each section channels the magic of

discovery found in exploring San Francisco, and will be fabricated using hand-glazed ceramic tile and Byzantine glass smalti.

There was no public comment.

A) Federal Inspection Service (FIS) East Art Wall

Motion to approve the conceptual design proposal by Tomashi Jackson for the Terminal 3 West C4C FIS East Art Wall Public Art Project, as recommended by the Artist Review Panel.

Motion to authorize the Director of Cultural Affairs to enter into a contract with Tomashi Jackson for an amount not to exceed \$400,000 for the design, fabrication, insurance, and consultation during installation of a tile and glass mosaic artwork for the Terminal 3 West C4C FIS East Art Wall Public Art Project.

B) Federal Inspection Service (FIS) West Art Wall

Motion to approve the conceptual design proposal *From Bridge to Bridge and Our Life in Between* by Muzae Sesay for the Terminal 3 West C4C FIS West Art Wall Public Art Project, as recommended by the Artist Review Panel.

Motion to authorize the Director of Cultural Affairs to enter into a contract with Muzae Sesay for an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the design, fabrication, insurance, and consultation during installation of a mosaic tile artwork for the Terminal 3 West C4C FIS West Art Wall Public Art Project.

Moved: Walker/Musleh

The motion unanimously carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Musleh, Shelby, Shiota, Walker

6. San Francisco Main Library – Temporary Atrium Mural

(48:47)

Senior Program Manager Jackie von Treskow presented the final artwork design for the San Francisco Public Library Temporary Mural, created by

artist Belen Islas in collaboration with Dr. Jonathan Cordero of the Association of the Ramaytush Ohlone. This project, funded by the Library, aims to highlight the importance of intergenerational knowledge sharing from an Indigenous perspective. The mural will be installed in the atrium of the Main Branch Library, above the staircase leading to the Fisher Children's Center, and will be printed on high-quality vinyl for a two-year display. The total project budget is \$52,000, covering both the artist's design and the mural's fabrication, installation, maintenance, and removal.

The mural, titled *Atemtuhe* (meaning "to listen"), builds on the concept previously approved in July, emphasizing circularity and the continuous cycle of learning between Elders and children. The design features a vibrant California landscape with native flora and fauna, interwoven with Indigenous symbols representing natural elements like wind, sun, and water. These elements, along with scenes of storytelling, play, and ceremony, reflect Indigenous ways of knowing and the deep connection between cultural knowledge and ecological heritage.

Now complete, the hand-painted artwork has been digitized for printing. Once approved, the digital file will be sent for production, marking the final step before this meaningful artwork becomes a vibrant part of the Library's space. Installation is scheduled for October 12–13, during the Library's closure for Indigenous Peoples Day, with a public unveiling on October 14 at 9:00 a.m.

There was no public comment.

Motion to approve the final design of an artwork by Maria Belen Islas Cuellar (Belen Islas), in collaboration with the Association of the Ramaytush Ohlone, for the San Francisco Main Library Temporary Atrium Mural Project.

Moved: Walker/Musleh

The motion unanimously carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Musleh, Shelby, Shiota, Walker

7. Staff Report

(56:14)

There was no staff report.

There was no public comment.

8. New Business & Announcements

(57:00)

There was no new business or announcements.

There was no public comment.

9. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:07 p.m.

Posted 10/9/2025, 3:00pm pc

Archives Available

A recording of this meeting will be available online after the meeting at the following address:

https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=152

Language Accessibility

Translated written materials and interpretation services are available to you at no cost. For assistance, please notify Tara Peterson, 415-252-2219, tara.peterson@sfgov.org.

我們將為閣下提供免費的書面翻譯資料和口譯服務。如需協助 Tara Peterson, 415-252-2219, tara.peterson@sfgov.org.

Materiales traducidos y servicios de interpretación están disponibles para usted de manera gratuita. Para asistencia, notifique a Tara Peterson, 415-252-2219, tara.peterson@sfgov.org.

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: October 15, 2025 Visual Arts Committee Agenda
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 10:47:00 AM
Attachments: [Oct 15 2025 VAC Agenda Amended.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Arts Commission, submitting an agenda for the October 15, 2025, Visual Arts Committee 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: Peterson, Tara (ART) <tara.peterson@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 4:51 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART) <manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org>; Limcaco, Veronica (ART) <veronica.limcaco@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: October 15, 2025 Visual Arts Committee Agenda

Re-sending with corrected day of the week in the pdf. The online agenda was correct.

Sorry for the inconvenience.

Thank you,

Tara



Tara Peterson
Registrar, Civic Art Collection & Public Art
Program
Pronouns: [She/Her](#)
Email: tara.peterson@sfgov.org
Office: 415-252-2219
Mobile: 415-819-5016

San Francisco Arts Commission

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

www.sfartscommission.org | <https://www.sfartscommission.org/experience-art/public-art>

[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.

From: Peterson, Tara (ART) <tara.peterson@sfgov.org>

Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 3:54 PM

To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Cc: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART) <manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org>; Limcaco, Veronica (ART) <veronica.limcaco@sfgov.org>

Subject: October 15, 2025 Visual Arts Committee Agenda

SAN FRANCISCO ARTS COMMISSION

VISUAL ARTS COMMITTEE

Wednesday, October 15, 2025

2:00 p.m.

Please see link and attached agenda.

[Visual Arts Committee Meeting | SF.gov](#)

Thank you,

Tara



Tara Peterson

Registrar, Civic Art Collection & Public Art
Program

Pronouns: [She/Her](#)

Email: tara.peterson@sfgov.org

Office: 415-252-2219

Mobile: 415-819-5016

San Francisco Arts Commission

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

www.sfartscommission.org | <https://www.sfartscommission.org/experience-art/public-art>

[Newsletter](#) | [Flickr](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#) | [TikTok](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#)

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

Please be mindful that all correspondence and documents submitted to the San Francisco Arts Commission are public records and, as such, are subject to the [Sunshine Ordinance](#) and can be requested by the public. If this happens, personal information such as personal emails, Social Security numbers and phone numbers will be redacted.

MEETING OF THE VISUAL ARTS COMMITTEE

**Wednesday, October 15, 2025
2:00 p.m.**

**Hybrid Meeting
City Hall, Room 416
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102**

Agenda

Members of the Visual Arts Committee will attend this meeting in person at the location listed above. Members of the public are invited to observe the meeting in person at the physical meeting location listed above or remotely on SFGovTV. Members of the public attending the meeting in-person will have an opportunity to provide public comment on every agenda item.

Visual Arts Committee Commissioners: Suzie Ferras, Chair; JD Beltran; Nabil Musleh; Al Perez; McKenna Quint; Debra Walker.

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

- Call to order
- Roll call / Confirmation of quorum
- Agenda Changes
- Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgement

The San Francisco Arts Commission acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone who the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula are. As the indigenous stewards of this land and in accordance with their traditions, the Ramaytush Ohlone have never ceded, lost nor forgotten their responsibilities as the caretakers of this place, as well as for all peoples who reside in their traditional territory. As guests, we recognize that we

benefit from living and working on their traditional homeland. We wish to pay our respects by acknowledging the ancestors, elders and relatives of the Ramaytush Community and by affirming their sovereign rights as First Peoples. As a department dedicated to promoting a diverse and equitable Arts and Culture environment in San Francisco, we are committed to supporting the traditional and contemporary evolution of the American Indian community.

2. General Public Comment

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

3. Consent Calendar

Discussion and Possible Action

1. Motion to approve *When One Sees A Rainbow*, a mural design by Leah Rosenberg. The mural will be installed on the facade of Contemporary Jewish Museum, located at 736 Mission Street, between 3rd and 4th streets in District 6. The mural covers 6 windows (four H 99 in by W57 in.; one 120 in. by 101 in.; one 88 in. by 99 in.) and 34 steps (8 ft. by 14 in.). The artwork is funded by Art All Around Program of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and will not become part of the Civic Art Collection. The artwork will be maintained by the Yerba Buena Community Benefit District.
2. Motion to approve *Jaguar Creativo*, a mural design by Ivan Lopez. The mural will be installed at Artillery Ceramics, 2751 Mission Street, in District 9. The mural measures approximately H18 in. by W17 ft. 5 in. The artwork is funded by SF Shines Grant, a program of the Community Economic Development (CED) division of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and will not become part of the Civic Art Collection; the artwork will be maintained by the artist as well as Artillery Ceramics.

3. Motion to approve and accept into the Civic Art Collection 2024.1, *Whorl Whirl: Our Circular Nature* by Norie Sato. The painted aluminum and stainless-steel sculpture on the north façade of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Southeast Wastewater Treatment Plant on Evans Avenue measures approximately 31 ft. high by 335 ft. wide.
4. Motion to approve and accept into the Civic Art Collection 2025.12, *Pacific Transit*, 2024, by Jesse Schlesinger at Judah St. and 43rd Ave. and Judah St. and Lower Great Highway. The artwork is composed of ten sculptures made of concrete, stone, and bronze. Seven sculptures are located at 43rd Ave., and three are located at Lower Great Highway. The sculptures range in size from 4 ft. to 7 ft. tall and 1 to 1-1/2 ft. wide.
5. Motion to retroactively approve and accept into the Civic Art Collection 2019.59, *W.F.T. (San Francisco)*, 2019, by Joseph Kosuth, a text-based illuminated neon artwork installed on the western-facing façades of the Bill Graham Civic Auditorium.

Explanatory Documents: Mural Packet

4. Big Art Loop Discussion

Presentation on the Big Art Loop program.

Presenter: Civic Art Collection & Public Art Program Director Mary Chou with the CEO of Big Art Loop Aliza Marks and COO of Building 180 Meredith Winner

Presentation Time: Approximately 7 minutes

5. SFAC Galleries Mentorship and Exhibition Fellowship Discussion and Possible Action

Discussion and possible action for the Director of Cultural Affairs to

approve an honorarium in the amount of \$5000 to Shirin Makaremi to be a mentor of the two selected mentorship and exhibition fellowship artists for the period of November 2025 – March 2026.

Discussion and possible action for the Director of Cultural Affairs to approve a curator honorarium in the amount of \$5000 to Shirin Makaremi for the development of the fellowship exhibition (title TBD) and public programs to be held in the SFAC Main Gallery from May 28 – August 22, 2026.

Discussion and possible action for the Director of Cultural Affairs to approve a fellowship honorarium in the amount of \$5000 to Kelley Finley and \$5000 to Tricia Rainwater for the period of November 2025 – March 2026.

Discussion and possible action for the Director of Cultural Affairs to approve the artist honorarium in the amount of \$3000 to Kelley Finley and \$3000 to Tricia Rainwater for the development of artwork for the fellowship exhibition (title TBD) to be held in the SFAC Main Gallery from May 28 – August 22, 2026.

Staff Presenter: Acting Director of Galleries and Public Programs Jackie Im

Presentation Time: Approximately 10 minutes

Explanatory Document: Slideshow

6. Gene Friend Recreation Center Project

Discussion and Possible Action

Discussion and possible action to approve the final design and construction documentation of *Barrio Fiesta*, an integrated-wall artwork by Cece Carpio for the Gene Friend Recreation Center Public Art Project, located at 6th and Folsom Streets in SOMA.

Staff Presenter: Project Manager Arianne G. Davidian

Presentation Time: Approximately 6 minutes

Explanatory Document: Final Design, Construction Documentation

7. Mission Branch Library Project

Discussion and Possible Action

Discussion and possible action to approve the final design of *Nopal de la Misión*, a wall-integrated artwork by Juana Alicia Araiza for the Mission Branch Library Public Art Project, located at 24th and Bartlett Streets in the Mission District.

Staff Presenter: Project Manager Arianne G. Davidian

Presentation Time: Approximately 6 minutes

Explanatory Document: Final Design

8. San Francisco International Airport Terminal 3 West Modernization Public Art Project

Discussion and Possible Action

A) Arrivals Art Wall

Discussion and possible action to approve the conceptual design proposal [title to be announced at meeting] by [Artist to be announced at meeting] for the Terminal 3 West Arrivals Art Wall Public Art Project, as recommended by the Artist Review Panel.

Discussion and possible action to authorize the Director of Cultural Affairs to enter into contract with [Artist to be announced at meeting] for an amount not to exceed \$200,000 for the design, fabrication, insurance, transportation, and consultation during installation of an artwork for the Terminal 3 West Arrivals Art Wall Public Art Project.

B) Wheelchair Lounge Art Wall

Discussion and possible action to approve the conceptual design proposal [title to be announced at meeting] by [Artist to be announced at meeting] for the Terminal 3 West Wheelchair Lounge Art Wall Public Art Project, as recommended by the Artist Review Panel.

Discussion and possible action to authorize the Director of Cultural Affairs to enter into contract with [Artist to be announced at meeting] for an amount not to exceed \$200,000 for the design, fabrication, insurance, transportation, and consultation during installation of an artwork for the Terminal 3 West Wheelchair Lounge Art Wall Public Art Project.

Staff Presenter: Senior Program Manager Amy Owen

Presentation Time: Approximately 7 minutes
Explanatory Document: Artwork Proposals

9. Staff Report

Discussion

Presentation of Civic Art Collection and Public Art Program updates.

Presenter: Civic Art Collection & Public Art Program Director Mary Chou
Presentation Time: Approximately 5 minutes

10. New Business and Announcements

(This item is to allow the Commissioners to introduce without discussion new agenda items for consideration, to report on recent arts activities and to make announcements in accordance with [Prop D.](#))

11. Adjournment

Action

Agenda posted 10/9/2025, TP 3:15PM.
Typo on day of week corrected. 10/9/2025, TP 4:42PM

Notices

The meetings of the Visual Arts Committee will be held in “hybrid format” with the meeting occurring in-person at City Hall, room 416 and available to view live at <https://sfgovtv.org/sfgovtv-live-events>.

Agenda Item Information / Materials Available

Each item on the agenda may include the following documents:

- 1) Department or Agency or report;
- 2) Public correspondence;
- 3) Other explanatory documents.

Explanatory documents listed above, as well as documents created or distributed after the posting of this agenda to the Arts Commission will be available only electronically at <https://sf.gov/departments/visual-arts-committee-arts-commission>. Please contact: Tara Peterson at tara.peterson@sfgov.org or 415-252-2219. PLEASE NOTE: The Arts

Commission often receives documents created or submitted by other City officials, agencies or departments after the posting of the Arts Commission agenda. For such documents or presentations, members of the public may wish to contact the originating agency if they seek documents not yet provided to the Arts Commission.

Meeting Procedures

1. Agenda items will normally be heard in order. Please note, that on occasion a special circumstance may necessitate that an agenda item be taken out of order. To ensure that an agenda item is not missed, it is advised to arrive at the beginning of the meeting. All agenda changes will be announced by the Chair at the top of the meeting.
2. Public comment will be taken before or during the Committee's consideration of each agenda item. Each speaker will be allowed to speak for the time allotted by the Chair at the top of the meeting for up to three (3) minutes.
3. During General Public Comment, members of the public may address the Commissioners on matters that are within the Arts Commission's jurisdiction and are not on the agenda.
4. Any person speaking during a public comment period may supply a brief written summary of their comments, which shall, if no more than 150 words, be included in the official file. Written comments pertaining to this meeting should be submitted to art-info@sfgov.org.
5. Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may also submit written comments of 150 words or less regarding specific agenda items or general public comment regarding items under the purview of the Arts Commission. Written comments submitted to and received by Arts Commission staff via email to tara.peterson@sfgov.org by 5:00 p.m. before the date of the meeting, or received within 10 days after a public meeting, before draft meeting minutes are posted, will be brought to the attention of the commission and made part of the official public record. Please note, written public comment submitted to SFAC staff will NOT be read aloud during the meeting. Please see meeting agenda for meeting contact information. Note that names and addresses included in these submittals will become part of the public record. Submittals may be made anonymously.

Electronic Devices Prohibited

The ringing and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. The Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic device

Disability Access

To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact Tara Peterson at tara.peterson@sfgov.org or 415-252-2219, at least 48 hours before the meeting, except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline is 4:00 p.m. the previous Friday.

Archives Available

A recording of this meeting will be available online, 48 hours after the meeting at https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=152.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

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

Sensitivity to chemical-based products

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.

Sunshine Ordinance

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decision in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under

the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact by mail to Administrator, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco CA 94102-4689; by phone at 415-554 7724; by fax at 415-554 7854; or by email at sotf@sfgov.org.

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

Accessibility Meeting Policy

Per the American Disabilities Act and the Language Access Ordinance, Chinese, Spanish, and/or American Sign Language interpreters will be available upon request. Additionally, every effort will be made to provide a sound enhancement system, meeting materials in alternative formats, and/or a reader. Minutes may be translated after they have been adopted by the Commission. For all these requests, please contact Tara Peterson at least 48 hours before the meeting at 415-252-2219, tara.peterson@sfgov.org Late requests will be honored if possible. The hearing room is wheelchair accessible.

利便參與會議的相關規定

根據美國殘疾人士法案和語言服務條例，中文、西班牙語、和/或美國手語翻譯人員在收到要求後將會提供翻譯服務。另外，我們將盡力提供擴音設備。同時也將會提供不同格式的會議資料，和/或者提供閱讀器。此外，翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會通過後提供。上述的要求，請於會議前最少48小時致電415-252-2219向Tara Peterson, tara.peterson@sfgov.org 提出。逾期提出的請求，若可能的話，亦會被考慮接納。聽證室設有輪椅通道。

POLITICA DE ACCESO A LA REUNIÓN

De acuerdo con la Ley sobre Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (American Disabilities Act) y la Ordenanza de Acceso a Idiomas (Language Access Ordinance) intérpretes de chino, español, y lenguaje de señas estarán disponibles de ser requeridos. En adición, se hará todo el esfuerzo posible para proveer un sistema mejoramiento de sonido, materiales de la reunión en formatos alternativos, y/o proveer un leedor. Las minutas podrán ser traducidas luego de ser aprobadas por la Comisión. Para solicitar estos servicios, favor contactar a Tara Peterson, por lo menos 48 horas antes de la reunión al 415-252-2219, tara.peterson@sfgov.org. Las solicitudes tardías serán consideradas de ser posible. La sala de audiencia

es accesible a silla de ruedas.

Patakaran para sa pag-access ng mga Miting

Ayon sa batas ng American Disabilities Act at ng Language Access Ordinance, maaring mag-request ng mga tagapagsalin wika sa salitang Tsino, Espanyol at/o sa may kapansanan pandinig sa American Sign Language. Bukod pa dito, sisikapin gawan ng paraan na makapaglaan ng gamit upang lalong pabutihin ang inyong pakikinig, maibahagi ang mga kaganapan ng miting sa iba't ibang anyo, at/o isang tagapagbasa. Ang mga kaganapan ng miting ay maaring isalin sa ibang wika matapos ito ay aprobahan ng komisyon. Sa mga ganitong uri ng kahilingan, mangyari po lamang makipag ugnayan kay Tara Peterson sa 415-252-2219, tara.peterson@sfgov.org Magbigay po lamang ng hindi bababa sa 48 oras na abiso bago ng miting. Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng tanggapin. Ang silid ng pagpupulungan ay accessible sa mga naka wheelchair.

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: October 22, 2025 Executive Committee Meeting Notice of Cancellation
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 11:57:59 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[October 22 2025 NOC Executive Committee.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached, from the Arts Commission, regarding a cancellation notice for their Executive Committee meeting of October 22, 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: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART) <manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 3:02 PM
Subject: October 22, 2025 Executive Committee Meeting Notice of Cancellation

Hello,

The cancellation notice for the Executive Committee meeting for October 22, 2025, is posted here:

[Executive Committee Meeting | San Francisco \(sf.gov\)](#)

[Notice of Cancellation](#) (PDF)

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.



Executive Committee Meeting

Wednesday, October 22, 2025

1 p.m.

Meeting

City Hall, Room 408

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

Notice of Cancellation

Executive Committee Commissioners: Charles Collins (President and Chair), Janine Shiota (Vice President), JD Beltran, Marcus Shelby, Debra Walker.

The meeting of the San Francisco Arts Commission Executive Committee scheduled for October 22, 2025, has been canceled.

10/15/2025, 2:45 p.m., MSD

Notices

The meetings of the San Francisco Arts Commission will be occurring in-person at City Hall, room 408 and available to stream online.

Agenda Item Information / Materials Available

Each item on the agenda may include the following documents:

- 1) Department or Agency or report;
- 2) Public correspondence;
- 3) Other explanatory documents.

Explanatory documents listed above, as well as documents created or distributed after the posting of this agenda to the Arts Commission will be available only electronically, please contact: Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal at manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org or 415-252-2247. PLEASE NOTE: The Arts Commission often receives documents created or submitted by other City officials, agencies or departments after the posting of the Arts



Commission agenda. For such documents or presentations, members of the public may wish to contact the originating agency if they seek documents not yet provided to the Arts Commission.

Meeting Procedures

1. Agenda items will normally be heard in order. Please note, that on occasion a special circumstance may necessitate that an agenda item be taken out of order. To ensure that an agenda item is not missed, it is advised to arrive at the beginning of the meeting. All agenda changes will be announced by the Chair at the top of the meeting.
2. Public comment will be taken before or during the Committee's consideration of each agenda item. Each speaker will be allowed to speak for the time allotted by the Chair at the top of the meeting or up to three (3) minutes.
3. During General Public Comment, members of the public may address the Commissioners on matters that are within the Arts Commission's jurisdiction and are not on the agenda.
4. Persons who spoke during the public comment period at a meeting of the Arts Commission may supply a brief written summary of the comments to be included in the minutes if it is 150 words or less. The Arts Commission may reject the summary if it exceeds the prescribed word limit or is not an accurate summary of the speaker's public comment.
5. Persons unable to attend an Arts Commission meeting may submit correspondence to the Arts Commission in connection with an agenda item. The Commission Secretary will post these documents adjacent to the agenda if they are one page in length. If they are longer than one page, the Arts Commission will make such documents available for public inspection and copying. Please note, correspondence submitted to the Arts Commission will NOT be read aloud during the meeting. Names and addresses included in these submittals will be public. Submittals may be made anonymously. Written comments pertaining to this meeting should be submitted to art-info@sfgov.org.

Electronic Devices Prohibited

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

Disability Access

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

Archives Available

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

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

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

Sunshine Ordinance

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



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

Accessibility Meeting Policy

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

利便參與會議的相關規定

根據美國殘疾人士法案和語言服務條例，中文、西班牙語、和/或美國手語翻譯人員在收到要求後將會提供翻譯服務。另外，我們將盡力提供擴音設備。同時也將會提供不同格式的會議資料，和/或者提供閱讀器。此外，翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會通過後提供。上述的要求，請於會議前最少48小時致電415-252-2247向 Manraj Dhaliwal, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org 提出。逾期提出的請求，若可能的話，亦會被考慮接納。聽證室設有輪椅通道。

POLITICA DE ACCESO A LA REUNIÓN

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

Patakaran para sa pag-access ng mga Miting



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

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: Results of Sale of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2025F
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 10:43:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from the Office of the Controller regarding General Obligation Bonds, Series 2025F (Healthy, Safe, and Vibrant San Francisco, 2024).

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 Controller's Office of Public Finance <gabriella.shiferaw@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 4:34 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Subject: Results of Sale of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2025F

[Alternate text](#)



General Obligation Bonds, Series 2025F (Healthy, Safe, and Vibrant San Francisco, 2024)

On Tuesday, September 23, 2025, the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") competitively sold its General Obligation Bonds, Series 2025F, totaling \$83,635,000, (the "2025F Bonds") under the 2024 Healthy, Safe, and Vibrant San Francisco General Obligation Bond Program. This is the first sale of bonds under Proposition B (2024), which authorized the issuance of up to \$390,000,000 to fund projects including the acquisition or improvement of shelters, pedestrian and street safety

improvements, streetscape enhancements, and other public space improvements, as well as improvements to various City healthcare facilities.


The 2025F Bonds will fund the specific projects as described below, as well as associated costs of issuance.

The Projects

Proceeds of the 2025F Bonds will be used to fund the following projects:

(i) The acquisition or improvement of facilities that deliver healthcare services, including preventive care and behavioral health, with \$25.0 million for Chinatown Public Health Center and \$37.1 million for critical repairs, renovations, and seismic upgrades at Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center and Laguna Honda Hospital.

(ii) \$20.5 million for pedestrian and street safety improvements, streetscape enhancements, and other public space improvements.




The Chinatown Public Health Center will be funded in part by the Healthy, Safe, and Vibrant San Francisco Bond Program

Sale Results

The 2025F Bonds were sold via a competitive sale. The City received seventeen bids from underwriters, with Fidelity Capital Markets providing the winning bid at a true interest cost ("TIC") of 3.52%. The cover bid was provided by Morgan Stanley & Co. LLC at a TIC of 3.55%.

The final maturity of the 2025F Bonds is June 15, 2045.



The Controller's Office of Public Finance would like to thank and congratulate everyone who put in the hard work to successfully bring this transaction to market.

For more information, please contact the Office of Public Finance:

Anna Van Degna, *Director*: anna.vandegna@sfgov.org

Vishal Trivedi, *Financial Analyst*: vishal.trivedi@sfgov.org

Min Guo, *Public Finance Specialist*: min.guo@sfgov.org

[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 bos.legislation@sfgov.org.

To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.

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-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Manga as Art - Sunday, 10/26 @ SF Main Library
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:36:00 AM
Attachments: [Manga as Art - Flyer.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Public Library, regarding a lecture titled, "Dialog: Manga as Art."

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: Dear, Jerry (LIB) <jerry.dear@sfpl.org>
Sent: Saturday, October 11, 2025 4:21 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Manga as Art - Sunday, 10/26 @ SF Main Library

Dear Board of Supervisors:

Happy October! This is Jerry from the SF Public Library. I wanted to extend an invitation to a fascinating talk scheduled later this month in conjunction with the de Young Museum's manga exhibition. We have an expert manga/anime specialist, a professor from SF State University, and are currently working on inviting the curator of the exhibit (from the UK) to join the conversation.

Attachments included. Please feel free to share out with your communities.

Thank you and please have a look,

Jerry

Jerry Dear

San Francisco Public Library

Magazines & Newspapers Center

sfpl.org/magsnews

Event: Manga as Art

Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025

Time: 2-4 PM

Place: San Francisco Main Library

100 Larkin Street

Koret Auditorium

San Francisco, CA 94102

URL: <https://sfpl.org/events/2025/10/26/dialogue-manga-art>

Synopsis: In conjunction with the "[Art of Manga](#)" exhibition at the de Young Museum, humanities professor [Hanako Asakura](#), author and manga/anime expert [Gilles Poitras](#), and exhibit curator [Nicole Coolidge Rousmaniere, Ph.D.](#) will discuss the allurement of this vibrant and artistic storytelling medium, one that continues to fascinate new generations of readers.

The International Center
and the Magazines & Newspapers Center of the San Francisco Public Library present

Dialog: Manga as Art

Sunday, Oct. 26, 2025, 2-4:30 p.m.

Koret Auditorium, Main Library, Lower Level



In conjunction with **the "Art of Manga" exhibition at the de Young Museum**, humanities professor **Hanako Asakura**, author and manga/anime expert **Gilles Poitras**, and exhibition curator **Nicole Coolidge Rousmaniere, Ph.D.**, Research Director of the Sainsbury Institute for the Study of Japanese Arts and Cultures at the University of East Anglia will discuss the allurements of manga and its vibrant and artistic storytelling style, one that continues to fascinate new generations of readers.

de Young
museum



VIZ



INTERNATIONAL CENTER
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY



MAGAZINE &
NEWSPAPER CENTER
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

All programs at the Library are free.
Supported by Friends of the San Francisco Public Library.

All SFPL locations are wheelchair accessible. For accommodations
(such as ASL), call (415) 557-4557 or contact accessibility@sfpl.org.
Requesting at least 3 business days in advance will help ensure availability.



San Francisco Public Library

Main Library 100 Larkin St. (at Grove) (415) 557-4400 sfpl.org

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: OCME Accidental Overdose Report - October 2025
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:48:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[2025_10_OCME Overdose Report.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner, submitting an Accidental Overdose Report for October 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: Rodda, Luke (ADM) <luke.rodde@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 10:33 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Lutvak, Charles (MYR) <charles.lutvak@sfgov.org>; Tsai, Daniel (DPH) <daniel.tsai@sfdph.org>
Cc: Po, Vivian (ADM) <vivian.po@sfgov.org>; Serrano Sewell, David (ADM) <david.serranosewell@sfgov.org>; Johnston, Jennifer (ADM) <jennifer.johnston@sfgov.org>; Pojman, Natalie (DPH) <natalie.pojman@sfdph.org>; Liverman, Christopher (ADM) <christopher.liverman@sfgov.org>; Hayward, Sophie (ADM) <sophie.hayward@sfgov.org>; Bobba, Naveena (DPH) <naveena.bobba@sfdph.org>
Subject: OCME Accidental Overdose Report - October 2025

Dear Mayor Lurie, President Mandelman, and Director Tsai:

Please find attached the OCME Accidental Overdose Report for October 2025.

The purpose of this document is to comply with the reporting of accidental overdose deaths pursuant to Article 4, Section 227 of the City and County of San Francisco Health Code.

Regards,



Luke N. Rodda, Ph.D.
Chief Forensic Toxicologist and Director, Forensic Laboratory Division
Asst. Adj. Professor, Laboratory Medicine, University of California, San Francisco
[Office of the Chief Medical Examiner](#)
415.641.3688 | 1 Newhall Street, San Francisco, California, 94124

Accredited by the National Association of Medical Examiners | American Board of Forensic Toxicology | ANSI National Accreditation Board ISO/IEC 17025:2017 Testing

City & County of San Francisco
Daniel Lurie, Mayor



Office of the City Administrator
Carmen Chu, City Administrator
David Serrano Sewell, Executive Director
Office of the Chief Medical Examiner

October 14, 2025

The Honorable Daniel Lurie, Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

The Honorable Rafael Mandelman, President
Board of Supervisors

Daniel Tsai, Director
Department of Public Health

Subject: Report on 2025 Accidental Overdose Deaths

Dear Mayor Lurie, President Mandelman, and Director Tsai:

The enclosed report includes preliminary data of accidental overdose deaths in the City and County of San Francisco from the recent four months of June 1, 2025, to September 30, 2025. This report satisfies the ordinance's reporting criteria. For your reference, reports of preliminary data for accidental overdose deaths from January 1, 2025, to September 30, 2025, are enclosed. The preliminary number of accidental overdose deaths from January 1, 2025 to September 30, 2025 is 497, and for September 2025 is 38.

The preliminary number of accidental overdose deaths involving Fluoro Fentanyl, Xylazine, Bromazepam, Phenazepam, Medetomidine, and Desalkyl Gidazepam from January 1, 2025, to September 30, 2025 are as follows:

- Fluoro Fentanyl, 29
- Xylazine, 17
- Bromazepam, 9
- Phenazepam, 5
- Medetomidine, 3
- Desalkyl Gidazepam, 1

The reports are published by the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (OCME), Forensic Laboratory Division, to comply with local and state reporting guidelines and further OCME's mission to provide neutral data to inform policymakers. Please note, these results are preliminary as of testing to October 7, 2025, and are subject to change as the OCME finalizes the manner and cause of each death.

Pertinent for accurate use of these reports is understanding the source of the data and its subsequent summarization process. Decedent demographic and case information were obtained from the OCME case management system. Additionally, specific details from investigator narratives, forensic toxicology results, and where available, preliminary autopsy findings, were utilized. Collected demographic information included race, gender, age, fixed address status, fixed address location, and death location.

Due to their significance in accidental overdose deaths, the reported drugs for open cases were specific to fentanyl, heroin, medicinal opioids, methamphetamine and cocaine. Their detection in blood was captured to best determine relevance in each case. Medicinal opioid-positive cases required the presence of codeine, hydrocodone, oxycodone, morphine, hydromorphone, oxymorphone, buprenorphine, tramadol, and/or methadone. Heroin-likely determination was more closely evaluated, requiring the presence of specific heroin markers in blood or urine, expected morphine to codeine ratios, and/or case details consistent with heroin use. Closed casework included any drug and alcohol-involved accidental overdose where the death has been certified.

Sincerely,

A blue ink signature of Luke N. Rodda, written in a cursive style.

Luke N. Rodda, Ph.D. MRACI CChem
Chief Forensic Toxicologist and Director, Forensic Laboratory Division









cc: Office of the City Administrator
enclosures: Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Reports for January 2025 through September 2025

**Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report for
January 2025 through September 2025**



Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 7, 2025

**JAN-SEP
2025**



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.

"Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.

"No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).

"Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.

"Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.

For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.

"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.


"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE




Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 7, 2025

JANUARY 2025




0.00% Acc. Overdoses Open
100.00% Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender




26% Female
74% Male
0% Non-Binary

Race




2% Asian
29% Black
13% Latinx
0% Native American
48% White
8% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
6% 15-24
21% 25-34
11% 35-44
0% 45-54
0% 55-64
0% >=65


Fixed Address



74% Yes*
24% No
2% Unknown


*See Fixed Address Location

Fixed Address Location




28% 94102
20% 94103
24% 94109
7% 94124
17% Others (SF Location)
4% Others (non-SF Location)

Death Location



24% 94102
16% 94103
24% 94109
11% 94110
24% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.

"Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.

"No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).

"Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.

"Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.

For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.

"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.









"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE



Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 7, 2025

FEBRUARY 2025



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.

"Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.

"No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).

"Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.

"Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.

For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.

"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.


"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE




Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 7, 2025

**MARCH
2025**




0.00% ■ Acc. Overdoses Open
100.00% ■ Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender




11% ■ Female
89% ■ Male
0% ■ Non-Binary

Race




6% ■ Asian
24% ■ Black
15% ■ Latinx
0% ■ Native American
47% ■ White
8% ■ Other/Unknown

Age



0% ■ <15
11% ■ 15-24
18% ■ 25-34
23% ■ 35-44
3% ■ 45-54
24% ■ 55-64
21% ■ >=65
0% ■ Unknown


Fixed Address



70% ■ Yes*
27% ■ No
3% ■ Unknown


*See Fixed Address Location

Fixed Address Location




22% ■ 94102
15% ■ 94103
15% ■ 94109
9% ■ 94110
26% ■ Others (SF Location)
13% ■ Others (non-SF Location)

Death Location



18% ■ 94102
20% ■ 94103
23% ■ 94109
17% ■ 94110
23% ■ Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.

"Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.

"No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).

"Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.

"Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.

For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.

"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.


"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE




Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 7, 2025

**APRIL
2025**




0.00% Acc. Overdoses Open
100.00% Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender




28% Female
72% Male
0% Non-Binary

Race




2% Asian
24% Black
17% Latinx
0% Native American
53% White
3% Other/Unknown

Age




0% <15
9% 15-24
24% 25-34
17% 35-44
0% 45-54
26% 55-64
17% >=65
0% Unknown

Fixed Address




*See Fixed Address Location

Fixed Address Location




30% 94102
9% 94103
17% 94109
7% 94105
24% Others (SF Location)
13% Others (non-SF Location)

Death Location



28% 94102
10% 94103
26% 94109
19% 94110
17% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.

"Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.

"No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).

"Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.

"Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.

For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.

"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.


"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE




Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 7, 2025

**MAY
2025**




0.00% Acc. Overdoses Open
100.00% Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender




21% Female
79% Male
0% Non-Binary

Race




9% Asian
26% Black
22% Latinx
0% Native American
36% White
7% Other/Unknown

Age




0% <15
9% 15-24
19% 25-34
19% 35-44
19% 45-54
19% 55-64
19% >=65
0% Unknown
3%

Fixed Address




72% Yes*
24% No
3% Unknown
*See Fixed Address Location

Fixed Address Location




31% 94102
10% 94109
7% 94110
7% 94124
26% Others (SF Location)
19% Others (non-SF Location)

Death Location



28% 94102
10% 94103
19% 94109
17% 94110
26% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.

"Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.

"No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).

"Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.

"Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.

For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.

"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.


"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE




Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 7, 2025


**JUNE
2025**




Gender




Race



Age




Fixed Address




*See Fixed Address Location


Fixed Address Location



Death Location



Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.

"Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.

"No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).

"Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.

"Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.

For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.

"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.






"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE





Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 7, 2025


JULY
2025



*See Fixed Address Location



Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.

"Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.

"No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).

"Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.

"Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.

For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.








"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.

"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.




Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 7, 2025

AUGUST 2025



*See Fixed Address Location



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.

"Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.

"No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).

"Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.

"Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.

For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.

"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.


"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE







Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 7, 2025




SEPTEMBER 2025



84.21% Acc. Overdoses Open
15.79% Acc. Overdoses Closed



*See Fixed Address Location



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.

"Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.

"No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).

"Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.

"Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.

For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.

"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.

"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

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: Power Quarterly Report on Delegated Authority Contracts Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 21.43
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:29:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Power 21.43 Report Q1 FY25-26 signed.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the SFPUC, submitting a Power Quarterly Report on Delegated Authority Contracts, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 21.43.

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: Oliveros Reyes, Jennifer <JOliverosReyes@sfwater.org>
Sent: Friday, October 10, 2025 2:18 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Cc: Aboul Hosn, Samer (PUC) <SAboulHosn@sfwater.org>; Spitz, Jeremy (PUC) <JSpitz@sfwater.org>
Subject: Power Quarterly Report on Delegated Authority Contracts Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 21.43

Hello BOS team,

The following quarterly report has been prepared for the Board of Supervisors in accordance to Section 21.43 of the Administrative Code.

Best,
Jenny

Jennifer Oliveros Reyes (she/her/ella)
Policy & Government Affairs
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
joliverosreyes@sfwater.org
C: 628-249-8600



Date: October 2, 2025

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Through: Dennis J. Herrera, General Manager *DJH*
Barbara Hale, Assistant General Manager, Power *BH*
Michael Hyams, Deputy Assistant General Manager,
CleanPowerSF and Power Resources *jo*
Julia Olguin,
Acting for
Michael Hyams

From: Julia Olguin, Director, Origination and Power Supply *jo*
Justin Chebahtah, Regulatory Specialist, Origination and Power
Supply *JC*

Subject: Power Quarterly Report on Delegated Authority Contracts
Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 21.43

The following quarterly report has been prepared for the Board of Supervisors (Board) in accordance with Section 21.43 of the Administrative Code.

In Administrative Code Section 21.43, the Board delegated to the General Manager of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) authority to execute certain contracts with terms in excess of 10 years or requiring expenditures of \$10,000,000 or having anticipated revenue of one million dollars or more subject to specified limitations through July 1, 2030.

Administrative Code Section 21.43 also requires the SFPUC to report quarterly to the Board “the duration, product purchased, and cost of contracts entered.”

Awarded Per Administrative Code Section 21.43
Quarter 1 (July 1, 2025 – September 30, 2025)

CONTRACT TYPE	PRODUCT	COUNTERPARTY	DURATION	CONTRACT AMOUNT
Purchase	System Energy	Morgan Stanley Capital Group	12/1/2025 - 2/29/2028	\$11,853,956

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Kate H. Stacy
President

Joshua Arce
Vice President

Avni Jamdar
Commissioner

Stephen E. Leveroni
Commissioner

Meghan Thurlow
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager

This report meets the quarterly reporting requirements established by Section 21.43 of the Administrative Code for contracts executed under the delegation of authority.

Should you have any questions, please contact Barbara Hale, SFPUC Assistant General Manager, Power, at BHale@sfgwater.org and (415) 613-6341.

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: Notice of receipt of CESA Petitions - 19 Plant Petitions
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 12:13:40 PM
Attachments: [CA Fish and Game Commission Notice of Receipt of Petitions.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached, from the California Fish and Game Commission, regarding notice of receipt of 19 separate petitions to list various plants as threatened or endangered species under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA).

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: Bacon, Jennifer@FGC <Jennifer.Bacon@FGC.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 1:13 PM
To: FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>
Cc: cbs@acgov.org; clerkoftheboard@buttecounty.net; clerkoftheboard@cob.cccounty.us; ClerkBOS@fresnocountyca.gov; caomailbox@kerncounty.com; Catherine.Venturella@co.kings.ca.us; clerkoftheboard@lakecountyca.gov; cotb@maderacounty.com; bos@marincounty.gov; webmaster@mendocinocounty.gov; clerkoftheboard@countyofmerced.com; cob@countyofmonterey.gov; clerkoftheboard@countyofnapa.org; bos@placer.ca.gov; BoardClerk@saccounty.gov; Supervisors@sanbenitocountyca.gov; Board of Supervisors (BOS)

<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; allboardmembers@sjgov.org; oardfeedback@smcgov.org;
boardoperations@cob.sccgov.org; BoardOfSupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov;
shastacountybos@shastacounty.gov; clerk@solanocounty.com; district3@sonoma-county.org;
cobsupport@stancounty.com; boardclerk@co.sutter.ca.us; tcbos@tehama.gov;
ASKBos@TulareCounty.ca.gov; bospublic@co.tuolumne.ca.us; clerkoftheboard@yolocounty.gov;
clerkoftheboard@co.yuba.ca.us; alameda.ag@acgov.org; ButteAG@ButteCounty.net;
agcommissioner@ag.cccounty.us; fresnoag@fresnocountyca.gov; agcomm@kerncounty.com;
Agstaff@co.kings.ca.us; lakeag@lakecountyca.gov; Commissioner@maderacounty.com;
manager@marincfb.com; agcomm@mendocinocounty.gov; agdeptemail@countyofmerced.com;
administration@MontereyCFB.com; AgComm@co.monterey.ca.us;
agcommissioner@countyofnapa.org; placera@placer.ca.gov; AGCOMM@ s accounty.gov
<AGCOMM@saccounty.gov>; kgriffin@sanbenitocountyca.gov; DPH-San Francisco Agriculture and
PUE program <SFAgriculture@sfdph.org>; stocktonag2@sjgov.org <stocktonag2@sjgov.or g>;
smateoag@smcgov.org; agc002@agdept.com; siskiyouag@co.siskiyou.ca.us;
AgComm48@SolanoCounty.gov; SonomaAg@sonomacounty.gov; agcom50@stancounty.com;
sutterag@co.sutter.ca.us; rknight@tehama.gov; adavy@tehama.gov; aginfo@tularecounty.ca.gov;
AgCommissioner@tuolumnecounty.ca.gov; agriculture@yolocounty.gov; yubaag@yuba.gov;
cfbf@cfbf.com; eastbaygoatgrazing@gmail.com; info@acpwa.org; Jeff@alamedacreek.org;
Ready@buttefiresafe.net; info@ebparks.org; ryan.hernandez@dcd.cccounty.us;
info@firesafemarin.org; srfd.dspace@cityofsanrafael.org; info@smfd.org;
mcwater@countyofmonterey.gov; info@sanbenitolandtrust.org; parksandrecreation@smcgov.org;
info@openspace.org; info@openspaceauthority.org; parks@sonomacounty.gov;
info@sonomarc.org; Sater, Patrick(Pat)@Wildlife <Patrick.Sater@wildlife.ca.gov>;
meyer@yolorcd.org; info@yolorcd.org; BLM_CA_Web_SO@blm.gov; admin@bbid.org;
contact@dsrsd.com; customerservice@ebmud.com; zone7communications@zone7water.com
<zone7communications@zone7w ater.com>; bcedillo@bwgwater.com; info@southfeather.com;
custserv@paradisairrigation.com; info@southfeather.com; Jboucher@Twsd.Info;
info@westerncanal.com; customers@diablowater.org; info@westerncanal.com;
contactus@sjrecwa.net; info@kingsrivereast.org; info@lagunaid.com; latonwater@sbcglobal.net;
info@malagacwd.org; pmcgowan@panochewd.org; riverdaleirrig@gmail.com;
SierraCedarsCSD@gmail.com; pubaffairs@wwd.ca.gov; nkwsd@northkernwsd.com;
customerservice@rosamondcsd.com; admin@rrbwsd.com; sid@ocsnet.net; mail@semitropic.com;
swid@swid.org; ssjmud@ssjmud.org; tccwd@tccwd.com; djackson@tcwater.org; wkwd@wkwd.org;
admin@westsidewa.org; info@wormwsd.com; info@lagunaid.com; djackson@tcwater.org;
pubaffairs@wwd.ca.gov; info@hvlcsd.org; midoutreach@madera-id.org; info@mwdgsa.org;
info@rootcreekwd.com; bcpud@bcpud.org; Info@marinwater.org; info@nmwd.com;
outreach@soquelcreekwater.org; info@stinsonwater.org; btcwd@btcwd.org; info@lcwdh2o.org <in
fo@lcwdh2o.org>; DistrictManager@rrfc.net; uvwacs@cityofukiah.com;
kareneastsidewater@att.net; jwiersma@hmr.net; comments@mercedirwmp.org;
contact@miugsa.org; pmcgowan@panochewd.org; churley@waterandlandsolutions.com;
Info@planadacsd.org; info@tid.org; lidia@castrovillecsd.org; lupe@castrovillecsd.org;
info@mcwd.org; mcwater@countyofmonterey.gov; chayito@my1water.org;
conserve@mpwmd.net; info@pajarosunnymesa.com; pbcwd@pbcwd.org; cocwd@circle-oaks.com;
admin@mhcwd.org; customerservices@pcwa.net; info@slcwg.org; info@tcpud.org;
customerservice@fowd.com; Info@ohwd.org; info@rd1000.org; gm@rlecwd.com;

feedback@sswd.org; mail@carmichaelwd.org; hello@chwd.org; admin@aromaswaterdistrict.org; Info@PVWater.org; drew@sunnyslopewater.org; customerservice@sflower.org; sewd@sewd.net; wsidoffice@weststanislausid.org; lfalconwid@gmail.com; youtellus@sldmwa.org; info@oakdaleirrigation.com; admin@bbid.org; customerservice@coastsidewater.org <customerservice@coastsidewater.org>; mpwd@midpeninsulawater.org; info@mwsd.net; info@nccwd.com; info@onshoreline.org; wwd@westboroughwater.org; youtellus@sldmwa.org; info@valleywater.org; info@purissimawater.org; Info@PVWater.org; contact@svwd.org; cccsd@clearcreekcsd.org; amber@frvcsd.org; mgcsd@shastaemail.com; Lisa Faris <mwcd@att.net>; kbeasley.tid@cot.net; gm@rnvwd.com; CustomerService@sidwater.org; clew@scwa2.com; j.ames@bodegabaypud.com; info@forestvillewd.com; smcwwd@comcast.net; sonomawater@scwa.ca.gov; outreach@soquelcreekwater.org; mcave@townofwindsor.ca.gov; customerservice@vomwd.org; ahansen@delpuertowd.org; kareneastsidewater@att.net; info@oakdaleirrigation.com; PID@PattersonID.org; info@tid.org; wsidoffice@weststanislausid.org; ldicharry@tccanal.com; info@exeterid.org; office@ivanhoeid.org; kaweah@kdwcd.com; customerservice@ltrid.org; jmf@tulareid.org; accounts@stonecorralid.org; asmith@ocsnet.net; customersvc@tudwater.com <customersvc@tudwater.com>; ldicharry@tccanal.com; Secretary@wdcwa.com; info@ycfcwcd.org; dunniganwater@gmail.com; rd108@rd108.org; bvid@bvid.org; email@nywd.org; kim@rd784.org; info@southfeather.com; communications@yubawater.org; PlanningInfo@acgov.org; dsplanning@buttecounty.net; dsbuilding@buttecounty.net; CMotta@fresnocountyca.gov; kerncd@kerncounty.com; kgcg.planning@co.kings.ca.us; cdd@lakecountyca.gov; mc_planning@maderacounty.com; mba@marinbuilders.com; pbs@mendocinocounty.gov; ced@countyofmerced.com; staff@ccbabuilds.org; ceoadmin@countyofnapa.org; sacplan@sacounty.gov; vtafoya@sanbenitocountyca.gov; PIC, PLN (CPC) <pic@sfgov.org>; communitydevelopment@cityofsanmateo.org; e-permits@pln.sccgov.org; dpwwb@santacruzcountyca.gov; scplanning@shastacounty.gov; planning@co.siskiyou.ca.us; planning@solanocounty.gov; cdc@sonomacounty.gov; planning@stancounty.com; building@stancounty.com; communitydevelopment@stancounty.com; planning@tehama.gov <planning@tehama.gov>; Economicdevelopment@tularecounty.ca.gov; cdd@tuolumnecounty.ca.gov; jeff.anderson@yolocounty.gov; tracy.gonzalez@yolocounty.gov; aaron.brown@yolocounty.gov; CDSA@yuba.gov; spridmore@calcima.org; berrycreekrancheria@gmail.com; muwekma@muwekma.org; office@tejonindiantribe-nsn.gov; info@tubatulabal.org; info@tachi-yokut-nsn.gov; info@hpultribe-nsn.gov; info@middletownrancheria-nsn.gov; webmaster@rrcbc-nsn.gov; info@sv-nsn.gov; nfrancheria@nfr-nsn.gov; info@chukchansi-nsn.gov; info@gratonrancheria.com; epdes2@coyotevalley-nsn.gov; receptionist@mpapomotribe.org; webmaster@pinoleville-nsn.gov; pvtsecretary@pottersvalleytribe.com; admin@rvrtribe.com; sjelliott@hoplandtribe.com; tribaladmin@essentribe.org; tribaloffice@wiltonrancheria-nsn.gov; info@amahmutsun.org; muwekma@muwekma.org; office@cvmt.net; info@tamien.org; info@qvir.com; info@yochadehe.gov; info@cloverdalerancheria.com; info@gratonrancheria.com; reception@stewartspoint.org <reception@stewartspoint.org>; info@lyttonrancheria.com; office@paskenta.org; info@yochadehe.gov

Subject: Notice of receipt of CESA Petitions - 19 Plant Petitions

[View as a webpage / share](#)

California Redwoods



California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Receipt of California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Petitions

Greetings,

A notice of receipt of 19 separate petitions to list various plants as threatened or endangered species under CESA has been posted to the Commission's website and is available at <https://fgc.ca.gov/CESA#active-petitions> under "Active Petitions".

The petitions with their petitioned actions are:

- Abbott's bushmallow (*Malacothamnus abbottii*) list as endangered
- Alkali-sink goldfields (*Lasthenia chrysantha*) list as threatened
- Bearded popcornflower (*Plagiobothrys hystriculus*) list as threatened
- California beaked-rush (*Rhynchospora californica*) list as

endangered

- Carquinez goldenbush (*Isocoma arguta*) list as threatened
- Diamond-petaled California poppy (*Eschscholzia rhombipetala*) list as endangered
- Ferris' milkvetch (*Astragalus tener ferrisiae*) list as endangered
- Guggolz's harmonia (*Harmonia guggolziorum*) list as endangered
- Legenere (*Legenere limosa*) list as threatened
- Lesser saltscallion (*Atriplex minuscula*) list as threatened
- Lime Ridge navarretia (*Navarretia gowenii*) list as threatened
- Mount Burdell jewelflower (*Streptanthus anomalus*) list as endangered
- Pajaro manzanita (*Arctostaphylos pajaroensis*) list as threatened
- Red Bluff dwarf rush (*Juncus leiospermus leiospermus*) list as threatened
- Rincon Ridge ceanothus (*Ceanothus confusus*) list as threatened
- Shasta orthocarpus (*Orthocarpus pachystachyus*) list as endangered
- Slough thistle (*Cirsium crassicaule*) list as endangered
- Small pincushion navarretia (*Navarretia myersii* ssp. *deminuta*) list as endangered
- Veiny monardella (*Monardella venosa*) list as endangered

The notice has been posted with each petitioned species. Please refer to the notice and for additional information.

Sincerely,

Jenn Bacon
CESA Analyst
California Fish and Game Commission

[Click Here to visit our CESA 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 jennifer.bacon@fgc.ca.gov 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

California Fish and Game Commission Notice of Receipt of Petitions

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN pursuant to the provisions of California Fish and Game Code Section 2073.3, that on August 29, 2025 the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) received 19 separate petitions from John C. Hunter, Ph.D. to list various species of plants as endangered or threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). The petitions with their petitioned actions are;

- Abbott's bushmallow (*Malacothamnus abbottii*) list as endangered
- Alkali-sink goldfields (*Lasthenia chrysantha*) list as threatened
- Bearded popcornflower (*Plagiobothrys hystriculus*) list as threatened
- California beaked-rush (*Rhynchospora californica*) list as endangered
- Carquinez goldenbush (*Isocoma arguta*) list as threatened
- Diamond-petaled California poppy (*Eschscholzia rhombipetala*) list as endangered
- Ferris' Milkvetch (*Astragalus tener* var. *ferrisiae*) list as endangered
- Guggolz's harmonia (*Harmonia guggolziorum*) list as endangered
- Legenere (*Legenere limosa*) list as threatened
- Lesser saltscale (*Atriplex minuscula*) list as threatened
- Lime-Ridge navarretia (*Navarretia gowenii*) list as threatened
- Mount Burdell jewelflower (*Streptanthus anomalus*) list as endangered
- Pajaro manzanita (*Arctostaphylos pajaroensis*) list as threatened
- Red Bluff dwarf rush (*Juncus leiospermus* var. *leiospermus*) list as threatened
- Rincon Ridge ceanothus (*Ceanothus confusus*) list as threatened
- Shasta orthocarpus (*Orthocarpus pachystachyus*) list as endangered
- Slough thistle (*Cirsium crassicaule*) list as endangered
- Small pincushion navarretia (*Navarretia myersii* ssp. *deminuta*) list as endangered
- Veiny monardella (*Monardella venosa*) list as endangered

On September 8, 2025, pursuant to Section 2073 of California Fish and Game Code, the Commission transmitted the petitions to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) for review pursuant to Section 2073.5. The Commission will publicly receive the petitions at its October 8-9, 2025 meeting. The Department may request a 30-day extension of time to complete the evaluations, pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 2073.5. Once received, petition evaluations and recommendations will be listed on a Commission meeting agenda under "Public Receipt of Documents," with no discussion scheduled; discussion and

consideration of the petition will generally be scheduled for the following Commission meeting. The Commission anticipates petition evaluations to be received no earlier than December 2025 and, with extensions, January 2026

For information about the petitions or to submit information to the Department relating to the petitioned species, interested parties may contact the Native Plant Program, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, or at nativeplants@wildlife.ca.gov.

California Fish and Game Commission

September 11, 2025

Melissa Miller-Henson
Executive Director

BKS LAW FIRM, PC

BRIDGING PUBLIC & WATER LAW

Morgan S. Biggerstaff || msb@bkslawfirm.com || (916) 446-4254 x105
1600 K Street, Suite 4A || Sacramento, CA 95814
www.bkslawfirm.com/morgansbiggerstaff



September 26, 2025

VIA US MAIL

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



Re: Yuba County Water Agency Application 5632 & Permit 15206 – Petition for
Temporary Change Involving Water Transfers

Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors:

Consistent with Water Code section 1726, enclosed is a copy of Yuba County Water Agency's (YCWA) Petition for Temporary Change Involving Water Transfers (including Environmental Form and supplemental information) to reauthorize and extend the existing Yuba Accord Water Transfer Program (Accord Transfer Program) through December 31, 2026. The Accord Transfer Program consists of: (1) storage water transfers of up to 200,000 acre-feet per year; (2) groundwater substitution water transfers; (3) redirection of transfer water at authorized points of redirection; (4) use of transfer water within the State Water Project and Central Valley Project service areas; and (5) use of transfer water for authorized purposes of use.

As discussed in the enclosed materials, the proposed extension of the Accord Transfer Program will not involve any construction or changes to YCWA's operations under the Yuba Accord streamflow schedules, and any transfers will be made in accordance with existing regulatory conditions.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Morgan Biggerstaff". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Morgan Biggerstaff
Attorneys for Yuba County Water Agency

Enclosure(s)

Petition for Temporary Change Involving Water Transfers

Please indicate County where your project is located here:

MAIL FORM AND ATTACHMENTS TO:
State Water Resources Control Board
DIVISION OF WATER RIGHTS
P.O. Box 2000, Sacramento, CA 95812-2000
Tel: (916) 341-5300 Fax: (916) 341-5400
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights>

PETITION FOR CHANGE INVOLVING WATER TRANSFERS

Separate petitions are required for each water right. Mark all areas that apply to your proposed change(s). Incomplete forms may not be accepted. Location and area information must be provided on maps in accordance with established requirements. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 715 et seq.) Provide attachments if necessary.

☐ Point of Diversion Wat. Code, § 1701	☐ Point of Rediversion Wat. Code, § 1701	☐ Place of Use Wat. Code, § 1701	☐ Purpose of Use Wat. Code, § 1701
☐ Temporary Urgency Wat. Code, § 1435	☒ Temporary Change Wat. Code, § 1725	☐ Long-term Transfer Wat. Code, §§ 382, 1735	☐ Instream Flow Dedication Wat. Code, § 1707
Application 5632	Permit 15026	License	Statement

I (we) hereby petition for change(s) noted above and described as follows:

Point of Diversion or Rediversion – Provide source name and identify points using both Public Land Survey System descriptions to ¼-¼ level and California Coordinate System (NAD 83).

Present: See Attachments.

Proposed: See Attachments.

Place of Use – Identify area using Public Land Survey System descriptions to ¼-¼ level; for irrigation, list number of acres irrigated.

Present: See Attachments.

Proposed: See Attachments.

Purpose of Use

Present: See Attachments.

Proposed: See Attachments.

Instream Flow Dedication – Provide source name and identify points using both Public Land Survey System descriptions to ¼-¼ level and California Coordinate System (NAD 83).

Upstream Location: n/a

Downstream Location: n/a

List the quantities dedicated to instream flow in either: ☐ cubic feet per second or ☒ gallons per day:

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec

Will the dedicated flow be diverted for consumptive use at a downstream location? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, provide the source name, location coordinates, and the quantities of flow that will be diverted from the stream.

Proposed New User(s)

Provide the names, addresses, and phone numbers for all proposed new user(s) of the water right.

Yuba County Water Agency would remain the sole permittee. See Attachments.

Amount of Water to be Transferred

200,000.00 acre-feet will be transferred. If the basis of right is direct diversion, the average rate of diversion for the maximum 30-day period of use is cubic feet per second or million gallons per day.

General Information – Provide the following information, if applicable to your proposed change(s).

Have you attached an analysis which documents that the amount of water to be transferred or exchanged would have been consumptively used or stored in the absence of the proposed temporary change or long-term transfer? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Have you attached an analysis of any changes to streamflow, water quality, timing of diversion or use, return flows, or effects on legal users from the proposed temporary change or long-term transfer? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Have you attached an analysis that shows the proposed temporary change or long-term transfer will not unreasonably affect fish, wildlife, or other instream beneficial uses? ☒ Yes ☐ No

I (we) have access to the proposed point of diversion or control the proposed place of use by virtue of:
☐ ownership ☐ lease ☐ verbal agreement ☒ written agreement

If by lease or agreement, state name and address of person(s) from whom access has been obtained.

Yuba County Water Agency owns certain of the points of diversion and redirection associated with this water right and has access to the other points of diversion and redirection through written agreements. For more details, see Attachment s.

Give name and address of any person(s) taking water from the stream between the present point of diversion or redirection and the proposed point of diversion or redirection, as well as any other person(s) known to you who may be affected by the proposed change.

See Attachments.

All Right Holders Must Sign Below: I (we) declare under penalty of perjury that this involves only the amount of water which would have been consumptively used or stored in the absence of the proposed temporary change, and that the above is true and correct to the best of my (our) knowledge and belief.
Dated 09/30/2025 at

John James Digitally signed by John James
Date: 2025.09.30 16:35:02 -07'00'

Right Holder or Authorized Agent Signature

Right Holder or Authorized Agent Signature

NOTE: All petitions must be accompanied by:

- (1) the form Environmental Information for Petitions, available at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/publications_forms/forms/docs/pet_info.pdf
- (2) Division of Water Rights fee, per the Water Rights Fee Schedule, available at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/fees/
- (3) Department of Fish and Wildlife fee of \$850 (Pub. Resources Code, § 10005)

ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION FOR PETITIONS

This form is required for all petitions.

Before the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) can approve a petition, the State Water Board must consider the information contained in an environmental document prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This form is not a CEQA document. If a CEQA document has not yet been prepared, a determination must be made of who is responsible for its preparation. As the petitioner, you are responsible for all costs associated with the environmental evaluation and preparation of the required CEQA documents. Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability and submit any studies that have been conducted regarding the environmental evaluation of your project. If you need more space to completely answer the questions, please number and attach additional sheets.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CHANGES OR WORK REMAINING TO BE COMPLETED

For a petition for change, provide a description of the proposed changes to your project including, but not limited to, type of construction activity, structures existing or to be built, area to be graded or excavated, increase in water diversion and use (up to the amount authorized by the permit), changes in land use, and project operational changes, including changes in how the water will be used. For a petition for extension of time, provide a description of what work has been completed and what remains to be done. Include in your description any of the above elements that will occur during the requested extension period.

Yuba County Water Agency (Yuba Water) seeks the proposed temporary changes to Yuba Water's Water Right Application 5632 Permit 15026 (Permit 15026) authorizing a one-year extension of the Yuba Accord Water Transfer Program (Water Transfer Program) through December 31, 2026 while Yuba Water's long-term transfer petition to extend the program through the year 2050 (Yuba Accord Extension) is pending. To implement the Yuba Accord, Yuba Water releases water from its Yuba River facilities according to the Yuba Accord's streamflow schedules, as approved by Corrected Order WR 2008-0014. This one-year extension will not involve any changes to Yuba Water's operations under the Yuba Accord streamflow schedules and no changes to the Yuba Accord Fisheries Agreement are proposed as part of this one-year extension. No new facilities will be constructed or operated. Transfers made under the 2026 the Water Transfer Program will continue to comply with all regulatory requirements including SWRCB Orders (Corrected Order WR 2008-0014, RD-1644, RD-1641) and the 2019 USFWS and NMFS Biological Opinions for long term operations of the Central Valley Project (CVP) and State Water Project (SWP).

As discussed further in Attachment 3, this one-year extension will not result in injury to other legal water users or unreasonable impacts to fish, wildlife or other instream beneficial uses.

Coordination with Regional Water Quality Control Board

For change petitions only, you must request consultation with the Regional Water Quality Control Board regarding the potential effects of your proposed change on water quality and other instream beneficial uses. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 794.) In order to determine the appropriate office for consultation, see: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterboards_map.shtml. Provide the date you submitted your request for consultation here, then provide the following information.

Date of Request
09/30/2025

Will your project, during construction or operation, (1) generate waste or wastewater containing such things as sewage, industrial chemicals, metals, or agricultural chemicals, or (2) cause erosion, turbidity or sedimentation?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Will a waste discharge permit be required for the project?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If necessary, provide additional information below:

Insert the attachment number here, if applicable:

Local Permits

For temporary transfers only, you must contact the board of supervisors for the county(ies) both for where you currently store or use water and where you propose to transfer the water. (Wat. Code § 1726.) Provide the date you submitted your request for consultation here.

Date of Contact
10/01/2025

For change petitions only, you should contact your local planning or public works department and provide the information below.

Person Contacted:

Date of Contact:

Department:

Phone Number:

County Zoning Designation:

Are any county permits required for your project? If yes, indicate type below.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Grading Permit

Use Permit

Watercourse

Obstruction Permit

Change of Zoning

General Plan Change

Other (explain below)

If applicable, have you obtained any of the permits listed above? If yes, provide copies.

☐ Yes ☐ No

If necessary, provide additional information below:

Insert the attachment number here, if applicable:

Federal and State Permits

Check any additional agencies that may require permits or other approvals for your project:

- ☐ Regional Water Quality Control Board ☐ Department of Fish and Game
- ☐ Dept of Water Resources, Division of Safety of Dams ☐ California Coastal Commission
- ☐ State Reclamation Board ☐ U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ☐ U.S. Forest Service
- ☐ Bureau of Land Management ☐ Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
- ☐ Natural Resources Conservation Service

Have you obtained any of the permits listed above? If yes, provide copies. ☐ Yes ☐ No

For each agency from which a permit is required, provide the following information:

Agency	Permit Type	Person(s) Contacted	Contact Date	Phone Number

If necessary, provide additional information below:

Insert the attachment number here, if applicable:

Construction or Grading Activity

Does the project involve any construction or grading-related activity that has significantly altered or would significantly alter the bed, bank or riparian habitat of any stream or lake? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If necessary, provide additional information below:

Insert the attachment number here, if applicable:

Archeology

Has an archeological report been prepared for this project? If yes, provide a copy. ☐ Yes ☒ No

Will another public agency be preparing an archeological report? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Do you know of any archeological or historic sites in the area? If yes, explain below. ☐ Yes ☒ No

If necessary, provide additional information below:

Insert the attachment number here, if applicable:

Photographs

For all petitions other than time extensions, attach complete sets of color photographs, clearly dated and labeled, showing the vegetation that exists at the following three locations:

- ☒ Along the stream channel immediately downstream from each point of diversion
- ☒ Along the stream channel immediately upstream from each point of diversion
- ☒ At the place where water subject to this water right will be used

Maps

For all petitions other than time extensions, attach maps labeled in accordance with the regulations showing all applicable features, both present and proposed, including but not limited to: point of diversion, point of diversion, distribution of storage reservoirs, point of discharge of treated wastewater, place of use, and location of instream flow dedication reach. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, §§ 715 et seq., 794.)

Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 794, petitions for change submitted without maps may not be accepted.

All Water Right Holders Must Sign This Form:

I (we) hereby certify that the statements I (we) have furnished above and in the attachments are complete to the best of my (our) ability and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my (our) knowledge. Dated _____ at _____.

John James Digitally signed by John James
Date: 2025.09.30 16:35:20 -07'00'

Water Right Holder or Authorized Agent Signature

Water Right Holder or Authorized Agent Signature

NOTE:

- Petitions for Change may not be accepted unless you include proof that a copy of the petition was served on the Department of Fish and Game. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 794.)
- Petitions for Temporary Transfer may not be accepted unless you include proof that a copy of the petition was served on the Department of Fish and Game and the board of supervisors for the county(ies) where you currently store or use water and the county(ies) where you propose to transfer the water. (Wat. Code § 1726.)

ATTACHMENT 1

**ATTACHMENT 1 TO TEMPORARY CHANGE PETITION OF YUBA COUNTY
WATER AGENCY INVOLVING TRANSFERS OF WATER UNDER THE YUBA
ACCORD THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2026**

County

Points of diversion are located in Sierra and Yuba Counties.

Points of redirection are located in:

- San Joaquin County, added until December 31, 2025, by State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Corrected Order WR 2008-0014.
- Sacramento County, added until December 31, 2025, by SWRCB Corrected Order Approving Petition for Change on Long-Term Transfer, dated June 9, 2014.
- Merced County, added until December 31, 2025, by SWRCB Order Approving Petition for Change on Long-Term Transfer, dated February 25, 2015.
- Contra Costa County, added until December 31, 2025, by SWRCB Order Approving Temporary Changes, dated January 28, 2025.
- Los Angeles County
- Riverside County

Points of Diversion (POD) or Points of Redirection (PORD)

Yuba County Water Agency's (Yuba Water) existing POD and PORD, as identified in the SWRCB's file for Water Right Application 5632, Permit 15026 (Permit 15026), are as follows:

Permanent PODs:

- New Bullards Bar Dam on the North Yuba River.
- Browns Valley Irrigation District diversion on the lower Yuba River, approximately 0.75 mile upstream of Daguerre Point Dam.
- Daguerre Point Dam on the lower Yuba River.

Temporary PORDs for transfers, approved on Yuba Water's Permit 15026 until December 31, 2025:

- The State Water Project's Harvey O. Banks Pumping Plant, located near Tracy.
- The Central Valley Project's C.W. "Bill" Jones Pumping Plant, located near Tracy.
- The Freeport Regional Water Project intake, located on the Sacramento River near Freeport.
- San Luis Dam at San Luis Reservoir for potential storage of Yuba Accord transfer water, located near Santa Nella.

Temporary points of redirection for transfers, which are Contra Costa Water District's points of diversion, approved on Yuba Water's Permit 15026 until December 31, 2025:

- Rock Slough Intake – being within SE1/4 of NE1/4 of projected Section 33, T2N, R3E, MDB&M

- Old River Intake – being within NW1/4 of SE1/4 of projected Section 31, T1N, R4E, MDB&M
- Middle River Intake – being within NE1/4 of NW1/4 of projected Section 9, T1S, R4E, MDB&M

This petition requests no changes to the PODs and PORDs other than that the current temporary PORDs be authorized as PORDs for transfers on Yuba Water's Water Right Permit 15026 through December 31, 2026.

Yuba Water requests temporary extension of listing State Water Project terminal reservoirs as points of diversion for transfers on Yuba Water's Permit 15026 through December 31, 2026, as these terminal reservoirs will continue to be used to manage Yuba Accord transfer water:

- Castaic Dam, located on Castaic Creek in Castaic – being within N1/2 of SW1/4, projected Section 18, T5N, R16W, SBB&M
- Perris Dam, located at the terminus of the East Branch of the California Aqueduct in the Lake Perris State Recreation area – being within N1/2 of SE1/4 of projected Section 4, T4S, R3W, SBB&M
- Pyramid Dam, located on Piru Creek near Castaic and Gorman – being within SW1/4 of NW1/4 of projected Section 2, T6N, R18W, SBB&M

Place of Use

In SWRCB Corrected Order WR 2008-0014, the SWRCB approved, for transfers, the addition of the authorized place of use of the SWP (as shown on maps 1878-1, 2, 3 and 4 on file with Application 5630) and the CVP (as shown on map 214-208-12581 on file with Application No. 5626) on Yuba Water's Permit 15026 until December 31, 2025. No changes are proposed to the place of use other than to extend the authorized transfers to water users within the authorized places of use of the SWP and CVP until December 31, 2026.

Purpose of Use

Currently, Yuba Water's Permit 15026 allows for the following uses: irrigation, domestic, industrial, recreational, fish mitigation and enhancement, municipal, salinity control and water quality control. No changes are proposed to the purpose of use in this petition, other than the extensions necessary to continue Yuba Accord transfers through December 31, 2026.

Current and Proposed New Users

In addition to Yuba Water, current authorized users on Yuba Water's Permit 15026 are as follows:

- The California Department of Water Resources (DWR)

Andy Chu, P.E.
Supervising Engineer, Water Resources
Non-SWP Agreements Section
Division of Operations and Maintenance

Department of Water Resources
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001
Andy.Chu@water.ca.gov

Anna Fock, P.E.
Principal Engineer
SWP Administration and Integration Branch
Division of Operations and Maintenance
Department of Water Resources
1516 9th Street, 2nd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
anna.fock@water.ca.gov

- The United States Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation)

Melissa Vignau
Regional Resources and Planning Division Manager-Acting
Division of Resources Management
Bureau of Reclamation
Interior Region 10 - California-Great Basin
2800 Cottage Way - CGB 400
Sacramento, CA 95825
mvignau@usbr.gov

- Contra Costa Water District (CCWD)

Lucinda Shih
Water Resources Manager
Contra Costa Water District
P.O. Box H2O
Concord, CA 94524
lshih@ccwater.com

- East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD)

Alice Towey
Director of Water and Natural Resources
East Bay Municipal Utility District
375 11th Street, MS 901
Oakland, CA 94607
alice.towey@ebmud.com

No changes are proposed to the current authorized users other than to extend their authorized use via transfers through December 31, 2026.

Access to POD and PORD

Yuba Water has access to its permanent PODs through ownership or other agreements. In order to obtain access to the current PORDs, as extended for future Yuba Accord transfers, Yuba Water will sign agreements to extend the terms of the Yuba Accord Water Transfer Program through December 31, 2050 (Yuba Accord Extension). Under the Yuba Accord Extension, DWR, Reclamation, CCWD and EBMUD could divert, at the relevant PORDs, water made available for transfer by Yuba Water under the Yuba Accord Extension and Corrected Order WR 2008-0014, as its authority for transfers would be extended. DWR, Reclamation, CCWD and EBMUD would therefore continue to be authorized to divert Yuba Accord transfer water at the relevant PORDs, and Yuba Water would have access to those locations through written agreements.

Summary of Water to be Transferred Under This Temporary Change Petition

Yuba Water seeks these proposed changes to Permit 15026 to authorize the extension of the Yuba Accord Water Transfer Program through December 31, 2026 while Yuba Water's petition for the long-term Yuba Accord Extension is pending. The Yuba Accord Water Transfer Program began being implemented in 2008 as part of the Yuba Accord, which was a comprehensive settlement that imposed a set of collaboratively developed, science-based instream flow requirements to protect and enhance fisheries and aquatic resources and improve local and state-wide water supply reliability.

The Yuba Accord originally consisted of three related agreements: (1) the Agreement for Long-Term Purchase of Water from Yuba Water by DWR, dated December 4, 2007 (the Yuba Water/DWR Water Purchase Agreement); (2) Lower Yuba River Agreement for the Conjunctive Use of Surface and Groundwater Supplies between Yuba Water and each of the Yuba Water Member Units (the Yuba Water/Member Unit Conjunctive Use Agreements); and (3) the Lower Yuba River Fisheries Agreement dated November 5, 2007 (effective March 18, 2008) among Yuba Water, California Department of Fish and Game (now California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)), South Yuba River Citizens League, Friends of the River, Trout Unlimited, and The Bay Institute (the Fisheries Agreement). In 2022, Yuba Water, CCWD, and EBMUD approved the Temporary Water Transfer Option Agreement Between Contra Costa Water District, East Bay Municipal Utility District, and Yuba Water Agency (Yuba Water/EBMUD/CCWD Water Transfer Option Agreement).

The Yuba Accord Water Transfer Program that Yuba Water seeks to extend is operated through the Yuba Water/DWR Water Purchase Agreement, the Yuba Water/Member Unit Conjunctive Use Agreements, and the Yuba Water/EBMUD/CCWD Water Transfer Option Agreement.

This temporary change petition would reauthorize and extend the existing Yuba Accord Water Transfer Program (Accord Transfer Program) through December 31, 2026, which consists of (1) storage water transfers of up to 200,000 acre-feet per year; (2) groundwater substitution water

transfers; (3) rediversion of transfer water at authorized points of rediversion (PORDs) as described below; (4) use of transfer water within the State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project (CVP) service areas; and (5) use of transfer water for authorized purposes of use.

The Fisheries Agreement will remain in effect until the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission issues a new long-term license for the Yuba River Development Project. No changes are proposed or will be made to the Fisheries Agreement in connection with this petition or the Yuba Accord Extension.

The Yuba Accord transfers and effects on the physical environment within the Yuba River watershed, Feather River, Sacramento River and Delta were analyzed in the Yuba Accord Final Environmental Impact Report (Yuba Accord EIR), as updated by five addenda. Yuba Water prepared, adopted and certified a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the Yuba Accord Extension (State Clearinghouse No. 2005062111)(Yuba Accord Extension SEIR), which updates the analysis to address the extension of the existing Yuba Accord Water Transfer Program through 2050.

The total quantity of water to be transferred under this petition will be up to 200,000 acre-feet per year. Yuba Water will make water available for this transfer from stored water released from New Bullards Bar Reservoir and through the substitution of groundwater for transferred surface water supplies consistent with the terms of the Yuba Accord Fisheries Agreement, the final certified Yuba Accord Extension SEIR and the Yuba Accord Extension's water purchase agreements and conjunctive use agreements.

The total quantity of water to be rediverted at the Freeport Regional Water Project PORD will not exceed 34,000 acre-feet per year and is also limited to 9,600 acre-feet per month.

The total quantity of water to be rediverted at the Contra Costa PORD will not exceed 25,000 acre-feet per calendar year, including 10,000 acre-feet to be transferred during the transfer window of July 1 through November 30.

The transfer water will continue to be used within the authorized place of use for Yuba Accord transfer water, which includes the service areas of the CVP and the SWP as depicted in the figures contained in **Attachment 3** to this petition.

Proposed Terms of Approval For Petition

Yuba Water proposes that the SWRCB approve this temporary change petition by adopting the updated terms stated in **Attachment 2**, which are the same terms proposed in the pending long-term petition for the Yuba Accord Extension.

No Injury to Other Legal Water Users or Unreasonable Effects on Fish, Wildlife or Other Instream Beneficial Uses

To implement the Yuba Accord, Yuba Water releases water from its Yuba River facilities according to the Yuba Accord's streamflow schedules, as approved by SWRCB Corrected Order WR 2008-0014. As with the long-term Yuba Accord Extension, this petition will not involve any changes to Yuba Water's operations under the Yuba Accord streamflow schedules, and no

changes to the Fisheries Agreement are proposed or will be made as part of the Yuba Accord Extension.

Yuba Water proposes that the SWRCB approve this petition by adopting the terms stated in **Attachment 2** and including those terms in Permit 15026. The proposed terms include certain terms designed to protect against injury to other legal users of water and unreasonable effects to fish, wildlife or other instream beneficial uses, including, but not limited to, refill criteria, diversion limits specific to PORDs, carriage water obligations, a streamflow depletion factor applicable to groundwater substitution water transfers, compliance with other relevant regulatory requirements and water right permits, a new term making it express that any upstream regulatory releases be accounted for as part of "Baseline Conditions" under the Water Purchase Agreement and continued implementation of applicable mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Yuba Accord EIR, as described in the Yuba Accord Extension SEIR.

As explained in more detail in **Attachment 3** to the Environmental Information form filed with this petition, there will be no injury to other legal users of water and no unreasonable effects to fish, wildlife or other instream beneficial uses as a result of the transfers during 2026 under this petition.

ATTACHMENT 2

**Attachment 2 to Temporary Change Petition of Yuba County Water Agency Involving
Transfers of Water Under the Yuba Accord Through December 31, 2026**

**Permit 15026 (Application 5632)
Proposed Approval Terms For Accord Transfers
As Edits On Compiled Existing Terms**

(Insertions in **bold underline**, deletions in **~~bold strikethrough~~**, text in *italics* comprises
non-substantive headings added for clarity)

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the petition of Yuba County Water Agency (YCWA) for temporary transfer of up to a total of 200,000 acre-feet per calendar year of water under Permit 15026 (Application 5632) until December 31, ~~2025~~ **2026** is approved, subject to the following terms and conditions. All existing terms and conditions of Permit 15026 as modified by the State Water Board Revised Decision 1644 (RD-1644) and ~~this order~~ **Corrected Order WR 2008-14** remain in effect, except as temporarily amended by the following provisions:

1. The transfer of water is limited to the period ~~from April 1, 2008~~ through ~~December 31, 2025~~ **December 31, 2026**.

Place of Use

2. The place of use of Permit 15026 is amended as follows: The authorized place of use is expanded to include the service areas of the State Water Project (as shown on maps 1878-1, 2, 3, & 4 on file with Application ~~5629~~**5630**) and the Central Valley Project (as shown on map 214-208-12581 on file with Application 5626).

Purposes of Use

3. Municipal use, salinity control, and water quality control are temporarily added as purposes of use under Permit 15026.

CVP/SWP Points of Rediversion

4. The Clifton Court Forebay and the Jones Pumping Plant are temporarily added as points of rediversion under Permit 15026. During the time period between December 1 and June 30, rediversion of water at the Clifton Court Forebay and the Jones Pumping Plant is subject to a combined rate of rediversion of 500 cubic feet per second, and the annual limit of water transferable through the Jones and Banks pumping plants during this period is 20,000 af, unless YCWA and **the Department of Water Resources** (DWR) petition the Deputy Director to allow pumping in excess of 20,000 af and demonstrate that this additional water was released for purposes other than transfer involving the Jones or Banks pumping plants, and therefore will not increase cumulative pumping from the Jones and Banks pumping plants during the December 1 through June 30 period. Upon such a demonstration, the Deputy Director shall approve the petition. During the time period between July 1 and November 30,

the maximum combined rate of rediversion at the Clifton Court Forebay and the Jones Pumping Plant is 1,500 cubic feet per second.

5. During the time period between ~~November~~ December 1 and June 30, the State Water Board reserves the authority, delegated to the Deputy Director, to order YCWA transfer diversions at the Delta pumps to be reduced or eliminated at any time that the effects of the diversions cause or threaten to cause a negative impact on fisheries in the Delta. Because this reservation of authority is intended to protect the Delta fishery in the face of uncertainty, it is limited to those times in which a cessation of the transfer will reduce cumulative pumping from the Banks and Jones pumping plants.
6. Rediversion of water at the Clifton Court Forebay and the Jones Pumping Plant pursuant to this Order is subject to compliance by the operators with the objectives currently required of ~~the Department of Water Resources (DWR)~~ and the United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) set forth in Tables 1, 2, and 3 on pages 181 to 187 of State Water Board Revised Decision 1641 (D-1641), or any future State Water Board order or decision implementing Bay-Delta water quality objectives at those plants, including the 2018 Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan, as it may be amended, and including compliance with the various plans required under D-1641 as prerequisites for the use of the Joint Points of Diversion by DWR and USBR. Rediversion of water at the Clifton Court Forebay and the Jones Pumping Plant pursuant to this Order is also subject to compliance by the operators with all applicable biological opinions, and any court orders applicable to these operations.

SWP Terminal Reservoirs - Castaic Dam, Perris Dam and Pyramid Dam Points of Rediversion

7. The PORD at Castaic Dam is authorized under Permit 15026 until December 31, 2026. The location of this PORD is located on Castaic Creek in Castaic, being within N1/2 of SW1/4, projected Section 18, T5N, R16W, SBB&M, as shown on map on file in Application 5630.
8. The PORD at Perris Dam is authorized under Permit 15026 until December 31, 2026. The location of this PORD is at the terminus of the East Branch of the California Aqueduct in the Lake Perris State Recreation area, being within N1/2 of SE1/4 of projected Section 4, T4S, R3W, SBB&M, as shown on map on file in Application 5630.
9. The PORD at Pyramid Dam is authorized under Permit 15026 until December 31, 2026. The location of this PORD is on Piru Creek near Castaic and Gorman, being within SW1/4 of NW1/4 of projected Section 2, T6N, R18W, SBB&M, as shown on map on file in Application 5630.
10. Rediversions of transfers at the Castaic Dam, Perris Dam and Pyramid Dam PORDs are subject to all terms and conditions that apply to DWR's operation of those facilities.

San Luis Dam Point of Rediversion

11. The PORD at San Luis Dam is authorized until December 31, ~~2025~~ 2026. The location of the PORD is on San Luis Creek at NAD 83, Zone 3, North 1,848,478 feet and East 6,393,579 feet, being within the SW¼ of the SE¼ of projected Section 15, T10S, R8E, MDB&M, as shown on map on file in Application 5632.
- ~~12. The maximum quantity of water that may be stored in San Luis Reservoir (SLR) by virtue of one or more Warren Act contracts between CVP contractors and USBR Reclamation under this Order is 70,000 afa.~~
12. Diversions at the PORD at San Luis SLR Dam are subject to all terms of any biological opinions and incidental take permits that apply to the operation of SLR by Reclamation USBR and DWR.
- ~~13. The PORD at San Luis SLR Dam is authorized to enable carryover storage of YCWA water transferred pursuant to this the corrected Order under one or more Warren Act contracts between CVP contractors and USBR Reclamation.~~
13. The addition of San Luis SLR Dam as an authorized PORD shall not authorize any diversions of water under Permit 15026 at Clifton Court Forebay and Jones Pumping Plant in addition to other than those otherwise authorized by this the Corrected Order.
14. YCWA shall provide a report describing the storage of YCWA water in San Luis Reservoir (SLR) authorized under this Order to the Deputy Director ~~for Water Rights~~ with the annual electronic report(s) of water diversion and use for Permit 15026 ~~covering the period of this Order~~. The report shall include average monthly rates and volumes of water rediverted at the San Luis SLR Dam PORD and shall include the annual total of water placed in storage in SLR.
15. This Order does not authorize any physical use of the CVP or SWP facilities absent independent agreements with DWR or USBR Reclamation for the use of those facilities.

Freeport Regional Water Project (FRWP) Point of Rediversion

16. A PORD is added at FRWP on the Sacramento River. The location of the PORD is: NAD 83, Zone 2, North 1,934,251 feet and East 6,702,930 feet, being within the NE¼ of SE¼ of Section 11, T7N, R4E, MDB&M.
17. The total quantity of water to be rediverted at the FRWP PORD shall not exceed 34,000 af per year and is also limited to 9,600 af per month.
18. Diversion of Yuba River Accord transfer water at the FRWP PORD is subject to

compliance with the conditions for FRWP diversions that are established in the following documents:

- a. California Endangered Species Act Incidental Take Permit No. 2081-2010-031-03, including Term 9.1 of the permit, which limits total FRWP diversions to 185 million gallons per day or 286 cubic feet per second with an annual volume of 147,000 af.
 - b. Department of Fish and Wildlife Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement No. 1600-2006-0321-R2.
 - c. All biological opinions issued by the USFWS or NMFS that apply to the FRWP diversion.
19. YCWA shall provide, with the annual electronic report of water diversion and use, a report describing redirection of water at the FRWP PORD. This report shall be submitted in addition to the report required by Condition 29, below, Term 6 on page 64 of the Corrected this Order and shall include the following information:
- d. The average and daily rates of redirection of water at the FRWP PORD under Permit 15026; and
 - e. The daily and monthly volumes of water redirected at the FRWP PORD under Permit 15026.

In addition, YCWA shall document that water made available at the FRWP PORD under Permit 15026 was water made available by New Bullards Bar Reservoir releases for transfer under Corrected Order WR 2008-0014 and this Order (Orders) minus any diversion limitations based on Condition 18 Item 3 above and any other limitations from the Orders. Transfer water does not include water delivered to YCWA member units.

Contra Costa Water District Points of Rediversion

20. The following points of redirection are added to Permit 15026, referred to as the Contra Costa PORDs in this Order:

- Rock Slough Intake – being within SE¼ of NE¼ of projected Section 33, T2N, R3E, MDB&M
- Old River Intake – being within NW¼ of SE¼ of projected Section 31, T1N, R4E, MDB&M
- Middle River Intake – being within NE¼ of NW¼ of projected Section 9, T1S, R4E, MDB&M

21. The total quantity of water to be rediverted at the Contra Costa PORs shall not exceed 25,000 acre-feet per calendar year, including 10,000 acre-feet to be transferred during the summer transfer window of July 1 through November 30.
22. Diversions at the Contra Costa PORs will be subject to all terms and conditions that presently apply to Contra Costa WD's diversions of water.

General Terms

23. Only Released Transfer Water, as defined in Exhibit 1 (Scheduling and Accounting Principles) to Exhibit YCWA-11a, as submitted during the State Water Board's 2007 hearing that led to Corrected Order WR 2008-0014 (the 2007 Hearing), as updated by Appendix A to this Order, may be transferred through the ~~FRWP~~ PORs authorized by this Order under this permit.
24. This Order reaffirms that under Exhibit 1 (Scheduling and Accounting Principles) to the Agreement for the Long-Term Purchase of Water From Yuba County Water Agency by the Department of Water Resources, as updated by Appendix A to this Order, any additional releases of water from Nevada Irrigation District's Yuba-Bear Project or PG&E's Drum-Spaulding Project, that are above the releases currently required of those projects, which may be required by a new license issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or by a different regulatory order issued by a federal or state agency, will be part of the "Baseline Conditions" for purposes of calculating "Baseline Flows" under Exhibit 1, which are the flows that are not transferable by YCWA.
25. The criteria delineated in the Reservoir Refill Account Provisions, Exhibit 2 to YCWA-11a in the 2007 Hearing, as amended by agreement with DWR and updated by Appendix A to this Order, shall govern the conditions under which future refill of the reservoir space that results from water transferred from storage pursuant to this Order ~~occurs~~. YCWA shall submit to the Deputy Director an accounting of the Impact Account completed under paragraph 12 of the Reservoir Refill Account Provisions by August 15 of each year, and shall submit to the Deputy Director a report of any impact account adjustments agreed to under paragraph 13 of the Reservoir Refill Account Provisions within 30 days after agreement.
26. Groundwater substitution (increases in the amount of groundwater pumped from the North and South Yuba Groundwater Basins in excess of that which would have been pumped in the absence of the transfer) shall be performed in accordance with the provisions contained in the Conjunctive Use Agreement portion of the Yuba Accord, as it may be amended.
27. The streamflow depletion factor (SDF) applicable to a groundwater substitution water transfer will be the amount agreed to from time to time by YCWA and DWR in consultation with the USBR, after considering water

management actions, such as groundwater recharge. The transfer quantity under a groundwater substitution water transfer will be reduced by subtracting the amount of streamflow depletion loss from application of the SDF.

28. ~~During the period the transfer~~ While this Order is agreement is in effect, YCWA shall comply with all applicable requirements ordered by Revised Decision 1644, as amended by Corrected Order WR 2008-14 and this eOrder. All of the instantaneous and annual limits on pages 59-60 of ~~the~~ Corrected Order WR 2008-14 shall apply to the total of all diversion under Permit 15026 at the ~~FRWPreport Regional Water Authority~~ PORD, Clifton Court Forebay, and Jones Pumping Plant, Castaic Dam, Perris Dam, Pyramid Dam, and the Contra Costa PORDs.
29. By ~~November~~ December 1, of each year, YCWA shall provide to the Deputy Director a report describing diversion of water at the Clifton Court Forebay and the Jones Pumping Plant and groundwater substitution performed pursuant to this Order. This report shall be submitted in addition to the August 15 report concerning reservoir refill accounting described in Condition 25 6 of this eOrder and shall include the following information:
- a. The average daily rates of diversion of water pursuant to ~~this the~~ this Order at both the Clifton Court Forebay and the Jones ~~pPumping~~ Pumping Plant;
 - b. The daily and monthly volumes of water diverted at both the Clifton Court Forebay and the Jones Pumping Plant pursuant to this ~~eOrder~~ eOrder; and
 - c. The monthly amounts of groundwater pumped to meet the needs of users within the YCWA service area in excess of that which would have been pumped in the absence of this transfer. Additionally, YCWA shall provide to the Deputy Director a report of anticipated NBBR releases for transfer above those required to meet ~~the applicable minimum flows required by this order~~ the applicable minimum flows and deliveries to YCWA member units, by five days before the beginning of the month. The report shall also contain the actual releases for transfer above those required to meet ~~the applicable minimum flows required by this order~~ the applicable minimum flows for the previous complete calendar month.
30. YCWA shall comply with the Mitigation Measures 6-1 (Yuba Region groundwater monitoring and reporting program), 6-2 (third-party impacts plan for groundwater substitution), 9-1 (carriage water for Delta water quality), and 9-2 (exercise of operational flexibility on reservoir refill), summarized in Table 6-1 of the Final EIR/EIS for the Lower Yuba River Accord, a copy of which was filed in ~~the 2007 Hearing this proceeding~~ the 2007 Hearing as exhibit YCWA-2, and with the monitoring and reporting programs for those mitigation measures, as set forth in Chapter 6 of the Final EIR/EIS. To ensure compliance with Mitigation Measure 9-1, YCWA shall not divert water from Clifton Court Forebay unless DWR is in compliance with Mitigation Measure 9-1, and shall not divert water at the Jones Pumping Plant unless USBR is

in compliance with Mitigation Measure 9-1. **The mitigation measures referenced in this paragraph are continued by YCWA's 2024 supplemental EIR.**

31. Pursuant to Water Code sections 100 and 275 and the common law public trust doctrine, all rights and privileges under this transfer and temporary change Order, including method of diversion, method of use, and quantity of water diverted, are subject to the continuing authority of the State Water Board in accordance with law and in the interest of the public welfare to protect public trust uses and to prevent waste, unreasonable use, unreasonable method of use or unreasonable method of diversion of said water. The continuing authority of the State Water Board also may be exercised by imposing specific requirements over and above those contained in this Order to minimize waste of water and to meet reasonable water requirements without unreasonable draft on the source.
32. This ~~e~~**O**Order does not authorize any act which results in the taking of a threatened, endangered or candidate species or any act which is now prohibited, or becomes prohibited in the future, under either the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code sections 2050 to 2097) or the federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C.A. sections 1531 to 1544). If a "take" will result from any act authorized under this transfer, the permittee shall obtain authorization for incidental take prior to commencing transfer of water. Permittee shall be responsible for meeting all requirements of the state and federal Endangered Species Acts for the transfer authorized under this order.
33. The State Water Board specifically reserves jurisdiction to add, amend, revise, supplement, or delete terms and conditions in the portions of this ~~e~~**O**Order that concern YCWA's transfer petition, at the following times:
 - Upon issuance of any Biological Opinion for the Central Valley Operations Criteria and Plan, if the State Water Board determines that changes are appropriate.
 - Upon issuance of a new license for the Yuba **River** Development Project by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, if the State Water Board determines such changes to be necessary or appropriate in light of any changes to the release, bypass, reservoir capacity, fish protection or related requirements in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission license.
 - At any time in which the groundwater levels in the **North and South Yuba** groundwater **basins** go below ~~1991 levels~~ **the minimum threshold levels identified in the Yuba Water Agency Groundwater Sustainability Plan**, or at any time in which lowered groundwater levels ~~in the North Yuba groundwater basin~~ cause or threaten to cause substantial injury to legal groundwater users, if the State Water Board determines such changes to be necessary or appropriate to protect legal users of water.

- Upon a change in listing status for any species in the Delta, if such change is appropriate to ensure that the actions approved in this order do not adversely impact the species, or that the protections specified in the order do not unduly interfere with the beneficial transfer of water.
- When appropriate to coordinate the operations of this project with (1) water quality objectives adopted to protect the beneficial uses of the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento- San Joaquin Delta Estuary (Bay-Delta Estuary) or (2) water right decisions or orders implementing the order. The State Water Board will make such additions or modifications to this order only when reasonably necessary to achieve the water quality objectives or protect the beneficial uses of water in the Bay-Delta Estuary.

34. Urban water suppliers must comply with the Urban Water Management Planning Act (Wat. Code, § 10610 et seq.). An “urban water supplier” means a supplier, either publicly or privately owned, providing water for municipal purposes either directly or indirectly to more than 3,000 customers or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually.

35. Agricultural water users and suppliers must comply with the Agricultural Water Management Planning Act (Act) (Water Code, § 10800 et seq.). Agricultural water users applying for a permit from the State Water Board are required to develop and implement water conservation plans in accordance with the Act. An “agricultural water supplier” means a supplier, either publicly or privately owned, supplying more than 50,000 acre-feet of water annually for agricultural purposes. An agricultural water supplier includes a supplier or contractor for water, regardless of the basis of right, which distributes or sells for ultimate resale to customers.

APPENDIX A

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THE RESOURCES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
AND
YUBA WATER AGENCY
AMENDMENT 8 TO THE AGREEMENT FOR THE LONG-TERM PURCHASE OF
WATER FROM YUBA WATER AGENCY BY THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER
RESOURCES**

PROPOSED EXHIBITS 1 AND 2

EXHIBIT 1

SCHEDULING AND ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES

OVERVIEW

Monitoring, measuring, and accounting of the water that will be transferred under this Agreement can be generally described as consisting of two fundamental parts: (1) measuring the flows at the Marysville Gage resulting from increased releases from storage in New Bullards Bar Reservoir that are greater than the baseline, without-transfer flows; and (2) measuring the ability of the Projects to apply these flows to beneficial uses. The amounts of increased releases will be determined by measuring the outflow of the Yuba River at the Marysville Gage, and by measuring groundwater substitution pumping associated with this Agreement. The Projects' ability to use the water will be determined by the ability of the Projects to export the water at the Projects' Delta pumping facilities or to put the water to other beneficial uses. That is, water accounted for as transfer water under this Exhibit will include Released Transfer Water that is deemed to be Delivered Transfer Water, as those terms are defined in this Exhibit.

1. DEFINITIONS

Terms used in this Exhibit have the same definitions as the definitions listed in Section 1 of this Agreement. When used in this Exhibit, the following terms have the following definitions:

"Accord Flows" means the schedule of instream flows listed in Exhibit 1 of the Fisheries Agreement.

"Baseline Conditions" means the conditions deemed under this Exhibit to represent the conditions that would have occurred without implementation of this Agreement or the Fisheries Agreement. "Baseline Conditions" define the without-transfer conditions and would result in the Baseline Flows.

"Baseline Diversions" means the diversions that are defined in Section 2.2.2 of this exhibit.

"Baseline Flows" means the flows that would have been present at the Marysville Gage under the Decision 1644 interim instream flow requirements and all other Baseline Conditions, without implementation of the Yuba River Accord.

“Baseline Storage” means the amount of water that would have been stored in New Bullards Bar Reservoir under Baseline Conditions.

“Baseline Storage Target” means the storage targets that are defined in Section 2.3 of this exhibit.

“Carriage Water” means the water losses due to increased Delta outflow necessary to maintain baseline Delta salinity conditions as determined by DWR and Reclamation, that are associated with Delivered Transfer Water or Stored Released Transfer Water that is exported at the Projects’ Delta pumping facilities.

“Delta Export Facilities” means the Banks and Jones pumping facilities as determined to be available for export by the Projects.

“Flow Fluctuation Operations” means operations driven by flow fluctuation criteria rather than minimum flow requirements or storage operations.

“Marysville Gage” refers to USGS Gaging Station No. 11421000, Yuba River near Marysville.

“Minimum Flows” is the required minimum instream flows specified in Decision 1644 page 176 table titled “Interim Instream Flow Requirements.”

“Negative Transfer Flows” means the additional amount of flows above the Accord Flows that would have been released as part of a Baseline Flows when the Baseline Conditions Decision 1644 interim instream flow requirement is greater than the Accord Flows. “Negative Transfer Flows” are further defined in Section 4.4 of this exhibit.

“Percent Inflow Diversion Loss” means the amount of Released Transfer Water that is lost due to the restrictions imposed by the “maximum percent of Delta inflow diverted” standard as described in the SWRCB Revised Decision 1641 when that standard is generally 35% from February 1 to June 30.

“Refill” is a condition of reduced releases from New Bullards Bar Reservoir as compared with the releases that would occur under Baseline Conditions. These reduced releases could result from diversions to storage to fill storage space evacuated as a result of releases that created the Storage Component of Released Transfer Water.

“Smartsville Gage” refers to USGS Gaging Station No. 11418000, Yuba River below Englebright Dam, near Smartsville.

“Total Uncontrolled Flows” means the total amount of flows entering Englebright Reservoir, other than from releases from the New Colgate Powerhouse, plus flows from Deer Creek and Dry Creek into the lower Yuba River downstream of Englebright Reservoir.

2. BASELINE CONDITIONS

Baseline Conditions are the controlling constraints and criteria for operation of the Yuba Project that determine Baseline Flows for the accounting of Released Transfer Water during the term of this Agreement. Baseline Conditions include the following:

2.1. Regulatory Instream Flow Requirements:

- 2.1.1. Decision 1644 interim instream flow requirements.
- 2.1.2. FERC License 2246 instream flow requirement of 400 cfs at the Marysville Gage (below Daguerre Point Dam) for the period of October 1-14, including the dry year reductions of this flow requirement that are authorized in the License.
- 2.1.3. Flow reduction restrictions required by FERC License 2246.
- 2.1.4. Flow fluctuation restrictions specified in the November 22, 2005 FERC Order Modifying and Approving Amendment of License (at page 11 of that order).

2.2. Water Supply Agreements:

- 2.2.1. Water supply agreements between Yuba and the following Member Units: Browns Valley Irrigation District, Hallwood Irrigation Company, Cordua Irrigation District, Ramirez Water District, Brophy Water District, South Yuba Water District, Dry Creek Mutual Water Company and Wheatland Water District.
- 2.2.2. Baseline Diversions that are made under the agreements listed in Section 2.2.1 are the measured diversions as reported by Yuba, including any reduced diversions that are made to provide water for the Groundwater Substitution Component Water, and including other reduced diversions that are implemented as part of defined water efficiency or conservation programs or projects.

2.3. **Baseline Storage Target Line** is a graphical line of the maximum storage levels during the year at which Yuba would normally operate New Bullards Bar Reservoir under Baseline Conditions. These storage amounts are to be used as a guide. In the absence of information showing different Baseline Storage amounts, the Baseline Storage Target Line amounts are to be used.

2.3.1. These levels are:

- September 30: 705,000 acre-feet;
- October 1 to October 31: linearly ramped from 705,000 acre-feet to 700,000 acre-feet;
- November 1 to February 15: 700,000 acre-feet;
- February 16 through March 31: linearly ramped from 700,000 acre-feet to 796,000 acre-feet;
- April 1 through April 30: linearly ramped from 796,000 acre-feet to 896,000 acre-feet;
- May 1 through May 31: linearly ramped from 896,000 acre-feet to 966,000 acre-feet; and
- June 1 through June 30: 966,000 acre-feet.
- July 1 to September 29: no fixed Baseline Storage Target amounts are provided for this period, because the maximum storage levels during this period at which Yuba would normally operate New Bullards Bar Reservoir under Baseline Conditions are governed by the runoff hydrology conditions of the Yuba River.

3. BASELINE FLOWS DETERMINATION

3.1. Baseline Flows will be determined as mean daily flows in cubic feet per second (cfs), with a separate determination for each day of the accounting period. Baseline operations will be characterized by four categories of operation, each of which are governed by the overriding operational constraint for the applicable time period. The four categories of operation are: (1) Operation to Minimum Flows; (2) Operation to Baseline Storage Target release; (3) Transitional Operations; and (4) Flow Fluctuation Restricted Operations. The four categories and the calculation to determine the Baseline Flows under each category of operation as well as a general description of when each category will occur are described below. Once one of the four categories of operation has been determined to be in effect, the procedures of this Section will be used to determine the resulting Baseline Flows that would have occurred at the Marysville Gage. Yuba will prepare a

guideline description of baseline operations that can be used by the Parties and others to understand the operations of the Yuba Project that would occur under Baseline Conditions.

3.2. Due to the complex nature of the controlling operational criteria for the Yuba Project and the hydrology of the Yuba River watershed, there may be periods when conditions will not allow for use of the accounting procedures listed for any of these four categories of operations to determine the Baseline Flows. Technical representatives from each Party will work together to attempt to resolve the transfer accounting for such periods. If the Parties cannot agree upon the accounting for such periods, then the dispute resolution process of Section 11.2 of this exhibit will be followed.

3.3. **Operation to Minimum Flows** is the controlling category of operation when releases under Baseline Conditions would have been made to maintain the minimum required flows at the Marysville Gage or at the Smartsville Gage, whichever is the controlling location. The flow requirements listed in the table titled "Interim Instream Flow Requirements" on page 176 of Decision 1644 are the regulatory minimum required flows under Baseline Conditions and are the Baseline Flows that would occur when this category of operation is controlling.

3.3.1. **Determination of When Operation to Minimum Flows Would Occur**

3.3.1.1. Beginning October 1, operations under Baseline Conditions will be considered to be at Minimum Flows unless or until there is a need to increase releases to manage storage levels at or below the Baseline Storage Targets. In the late winter and spring, forecasted runoff and resulting New Bullards Bar Reservoir storage govern when releases would exceed the minimum flows. For the winter and spring, if storage in New Bullards Bar Reservoir would have been at or above the Baseline Storage Targets with continued operations to minimum flows then a transition to releases above the minimum flow requirements would occur.

3.3.1.2. For the months of March through September, if, with releases from New Bullards Bar Reservoir to meet the Decision 1644 Interim Instream Flow Requirements and Baseline Diversions, the end-of-September Baseline Storage Target in New Bullards Bar Reservoir would have been at or below 705,000 acre-feet, then the Baseline

Flows for this period will be the Decision 1644 Interim Instream Flow Requirements.

3.3.2. Calculation of Baseline Flow under Operations to Minimum Flows.

If operations to minimum flows has been determined to occur as described in Section 3.3, then Baseline Flows will be calculated as follows:

- 3.3.2.1. Calculate the River Balance – The River Balance includes intervening accretions or depletions of the Yuba River between the Smartsville Gage and the Marysville Gage. The River Balance equals the measured flow at the Marysville Gage plus the measured Yuba diversions minus the measured flow at the Smartsville Gage.
- 3.3.2.2. Calculate the Baseline Flow – The Baseline Flows equal the greater of the required Decision 1644 Interim Instream Flow Requirement at the Smartsville Gage minus the sum of the measured Yuba diversion plus the River Balance or the required Decision 1644 Interim Instream Flow Requirement at the Marysville Gage plus any adjustments for Total Uncontrolled Flows that would not have been offset by a reduction in releases from Englebright Reservoir. The adjustment of Total Uncontrolled Flows will include short-duration increases in releases from the Narrows II Powerhouse due to short-term increases in power demands, power outages resulting in loss of control of releases from Englebright Dam and short duration uncontrolled runoff downstream of Englebright Dam that occurs when there is no Decision 1644 Interim Instream Flow Requirement at the Smartsville Gage.

3.4. Operations to Target Storage Release

- 3.4.1. For all times of the year, Operations to Target Storage Release is the controlling category of operation if operation to Minimum Flows would result in New Bullards Bar Reservoir storage above the Baseline Storage Target. If Operations to Target Storage Release would have occurred, then the Baseline Flow is the rate of release that would have been needed to meet the monthly Baseline Storage Target amount in New Bullards Bar Reservoir.

- 3.4.2. In the months of December through March, forecasts of future inflow and actual inflow are used to develop release decisions. During these months, operations are to manage storage to meet the springtime Baseline Storage Target, while avoiding spills of water from New Bullards Bar Reservoir.
- 3.4.3. If the end-of-September storage in New Bullards Bar Reservoir under Baseline Conditions would have been above 705,000 acre-feet with releases from New Bullards Bar Reservoir minimized to meet the Decision 1644 Interim Instream Flow Requirements and diversions, then the Baseline Flows will be the flow rate schedule that would have been needed to release sufficient water from New Bullards Bar Reservoir to meet an end-of-September storage of 705,000 acre-feet.
- 3.4.4. The accounting in wetter years in the summer period is based on reaching storage in New Bullards Bar Reservoir on September 30 as described in and subject to the provisions above. The water storage volume in New Bullards Bar Reservoir is affected by natural inflow, and the scheduled release of water from New Bullards Bar Reservoir is predicated on an estimate of this inflow. Because the release of water to achieve the target storage is relatively fixed as of mid-summer, Yuba and the Projects may revise the target storage volume in New Bullards Bar Reservoir if mutual agreement is reached.
- 3.5. **Transition Operations** would have occurred when Baseline Releases would have previously been governed by either Operation to Minimum Flows or Operation to Target Storage Release and the operational constraint would have shifted to the other type of operation. Under this condition, a period of transition would have occurred and flows would have been based on the specific conditions at that time, including actual runoff, forecasts of runoff, and planned operations. Because each circumstance of Transition Operations would have been different, Yuba will prepare forecasted Baseline Flows for the transition time period and provide supporting data to show why the Baseline Flows would have been expected to have occurred. Maximum hourly and daily rates of flow change are prescribed in FERC License 2246 and the "November 22, 2005 FERC Order Modifying and Approving Amendment of License" for the Baseline Flows operations.

- 3.6. **Flow Fluctuation Operations** would have occurred when the FERC License 2246 restriction on flow reductions in the months of October to March, or the restriction on flow reductions in the November 22, 2005 FERC Order Modifying and Approving Amendment of License would have required flows to be maintained above the minimum flows. Flow Fluctuation Operations would have been managed the same as Operations for Minimum Flows except that the minimum instream flow requirement would be prescribed by the flow reduction restrictions in FERC License 2246 or the flow fluctuation restrictions in the November 22, 2005 FERC Order Modifying and Approving Amendment of License, rather than the Decision 1644 Interim Instream Flow Requirements. As early as practical, Yuba will provide the minimum allowable flows for flow fluctuation operations as the Baseline Flows to DWR, along with an explanation of the determination of these Baseline Flows.
- 3.7. **Fishery Study Flows** - The Fisheries Agreement calls for the development of fishery studies. Some of the studies to be conducted could involve fluctuation of flows during some periods. If a defined flow release schedule is planned as part of a fishery study administered by Yuba or the River Management Team (a group defined in the Fisheries Agreement) under the Fisheries Agreement, then these flows in this schedule will not be part of Baseline Flows and, if all other aspects of this exhibit are satisfied, then the amounts of these flows that exceed Baseline Flows will be accounted as Released Transfer Water. Any reduced releases as part of a fishery study will be accounted as a Negative Transfer Flow if the conditions of Section 4.4 of this exhibit Negative Transfer Flow are met. At a minimum of fourteen (14) days prior to the start of any such study, and as early as possible, Yuba will provide notice of any Fishery Study Flows to DWR.
- 3.8. **Baseline Storage** - Yuba will use the Baseline Flow amounts to determine the daily storage in New Bullards Bar Reservoir that would have occurred under Baseline Conditions. The calculation of Baseline Storage will use the actual inflows into New Bullards Bar Reservoir and Total Uncontrolled Flows into the lower Yuba River, along with a daily calculation of the releases from New Bullards Bar Reservoir that would have been made to meet the Baseline Flows, to determine the daily Baseline Storage amount. The Baseline Storage amount will be used to calculate the Base Transfer amount for Refill accounting in Exhibit 2 of this Agreement.

4. TRANSFER WATER DELIVERY AND FLOW MEASUREMENT

- 4.1. **Point of Measurement and Delivery** - The point of delivery and the point of measurement of Released Transfer Water, and the point for determination of Baseline Flows, all will be at the Marysville Gage. The flows used for calculating Released Transfer Water and Baseline Flows will be mean-daily flows in cfs.
- 4.2. **Released Transfer Water** will be the amount of the actual mean-daily flow that has been measured at the Marysville Gage minus the mean daily Baseline Flows for the same day. The mean daily Baseline Flow will be determined according to the methods described in Section 3 of this exhibit.
- 4.3. **Stored Released Transfer Water** is water that has been accounted for as Released Transfer Water and that results in increased storage in an upstream Project reservoir (that is, water that is “backed into storage”). Released Transfer water will be deemed to have been stored in an upstream Project reservoir when the Delta is in Balanced Conditions, there is no available pumping capacity at Project Delta pumping facilities, and releases from Project storage reservoirs would have been greater or exports from Projects would have been lower in the absence of Released Transfer Water. The incrementally greater Project release necessary under Baseline Conditions will be accounted for as Stored Released Transfer Water in Project storage. This accounting of Stored Released Transfer Water will be kept to determine whether Stored Released Transfer Water can subsequently be released from Project storage and exported by the Projects to the Participating Contractors under Section 5.5 of this exhibit, and thus be accounted for as Delivered Transfer Water. Every effort will be made to account for Stored Released Transfer Water as backing into Oroville Reservoir as a first preference. This will necessitate an adjustment in the COA between the two Projects.
- 4.4. **Negative Transfer Flows** – During certain periods, the amount of the actual measured flow under Section 4.1 of this exhibit may be lower than the applicable Decision 1644 Interim Instream Flow Requirement. During these periods, the Baseline Flows will be the applicable Decision 1644 Interim Instream Flow Requirement. During these periods, the amount of the applicable Decision 1644 Interim Instream Flow Requirement minus the measured flow under Section 4.1 of this exhibit will be accounted for as a Negative Transfer Flow. If a Negative Transfer Flow occurs on a day when

all or a portion of the Negative Transfer Flow amount could have been accounted for as Delivered Transfer Water as described in Section 5.5 of this exhibit, then this amount will be deducted from the total Delivered Transfer Water for the Water Accounting Year in which the Negative Transfer Flow occurred.

- 4.5. **Groundwater Substitution Component Flow** – Released Transfer Water may be fully or partially derived from Groundwater Substitution Component Water. **Exhibit 3** of this Agreement describes the process that will be used to determine the planned amount of Groundwater Substitution Component Water that will be provided each year and the monitoring and reporting that will be conducted by Yuba and participating Member Units for Groundwater Substitution Component operations.
 - 4.5.1. Delivery and Measurement – Groundwater Substitution Component Water will be delivered at the Marysville Gage, and measured as Released Transfer Water under Section 4.2 of this exhibit.
 - 4.5.2. Water released as Groundwater Substitution Component Water will not be included in the transfer amount for Refill accounting in **Exhibit 2** of this Agreement.
 - 4.5.3. The total amount of Released Transfer Water that will be designated as Groundwater Substitution Component Water will be limited to the amount of groundwater pumping that is measured by the procedures described in **Exhibit 3** of this Agreement.

5. DETERMINATION OF DELIVERED TRANSFER WATER

- 5.1. Delivered Transfer Water may only occur when the Delta is determined by DWR to be in Balanced Conditions.
- 5.2. For this Agreement, it is assumed that Released Transfer Water measured at the Marysville Gage will reach the Projects' Delta export pumps 2 days after the date of measurement at the Marysville Gage.
- 5.3. For this Agreement, Released Transfer Water used as Carriage Water or used as Delta outflow when the E/I ratio is controlling in the time period of July 1 to January 31 by the Projects will be accounted as Delivered Transfer Water as described in Section 5.11 of this exhibit. For this Agreement, Percent Inflow Diversion Loss will not be accounted as Delivered Transfer Water.

- 5.4. For this Agreement, it is assumed that there will be no conveyance losses between the Marysville Gage and the Projects' Delta pumping facilities.
- 5.5. For each day that Released Transfer Water is accounted for under Section 4.2 of this exhibit, Stored Released Transfer Water accounted for under Section 4.3 of this exhibit is released from Project storage, a determination will be made, utilizing information provided by DWR that is described in Section 5.11 of this exhibit, regarding whether or not there was capacity available at the Projects' Delta export facilities.
- 5.6. Stored Released Transfer Water will be released from Project storage only if capacity at the Projects' Delta pumping facilities is available unless the water "spills" from Project storage before such export capacity becomes available and therefore will not be accounted for as Delivered Transfer Water.
- 5.7. The lesser of the following two amounts will be accounted for as Delivered Transfer Water if DWR has determined that capacity is available at the Delta export facilities as described in Section 5.11.
 - 5.7.1. The Released Transfer Water amount determined under Section 4.2 of this exhibit, or
 - 5.7.2. During any period when Percent Inflow Diversion Loss is occurring, only the incremental increase in exports that occurs as a result of Released Transfer Water.
- 5.8. For each day that there are Negative Transfer Flows as accounted for under Section 4.4 of this exhibit, a determination will be made regarding the amount of reduced Delta exports or increased Project releases that resulted from the Negative Transfer Flow. A Negative Transfer Flow will be accounted for as a reduction to the total amount of Stored Released Transfer Water if the effect of the Negative Transfer Flow is that it causes an increase in Project releases or reduces Delta exports.
- 5.9. Some or all of the Stored Released Transfer Water will be deemed to have been spilled from Project reservoir storage and will be debited from the account described in Section 4.3 of this exhibit, if the Project reservoir in which the Stored Released Transfer Water is stored makes flood control releases. The reduced amount will equal the actual amount of Stored

Released Transfer Water spilled, or the total amount of Stored Released Transfer Water, whichever is less.

- 5.10. Along with the accounting of Delivered Transfer Water, Yuba will maintain an accounting of the Base Transfer amount for Refill accounting. The Base Transfer amount for refill accounting will be calculated as the difference in volume of actual New Bullards Bar Reservoir storage and the Baseline Storage that is directly attributable to the release of Delivered Transfer Water from New Bullards Bar Reservoir storage.
- 5.11. DWR will make every effort to export Released Transfer Water and Stored Released Transfer Water based on the available export capacity at the Projects' Delta pumping facilities, as determined by DWR, which includes a determination of capacity available after delivery of SWP water and water for regulatory, water right and contractual obligations.

6. FORECASTING AND EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION FOR TRANSFER

- 6.1. Yuba and DWR will exchange operations forecasts and other data deemed useful for purposes of enhancing the usefulness of the water to be made available under this Agreement. The forecasts will identify and substantiate the quantities and timing of forecasted transfer flows over a range of possible hydrologic conditions, and identify forecasted periods of Balanced Conditions and water allocations for the CVP and SWP. Additionally, the operations forecasts to be provided will assist the CVP and SWP to efficiently integrate the Yuba flows in their operations plans.
- 6.2. Yuba will provide the following:
 - Updated forecasts of operations, monthly from February through June.
 - Updated forecasts as necessary, but not less than monthly, depending on changing conditions, from July through January.
 - The operations forecast should extend through the end of the current Water Year classification through January 31.
 - Initially, each Water Year, an operations forecast will be provided based on hydrologic probability of exceedance levels of 75%. DWR may request additional forecasts of difference hydrologic probability of exceedance levels as the Water Year progresses, depending on the need.
 - Each Yuba forecast will include:

1. Forecasted flows at Marysville Gage (daily for the first 30 days of forecasted flows and then monthly, or for a partial month if the dates of flow change within month are known)
 2. Forecasted Baseline Flows (daily for the first 30 days of forecasted flows and then monthly, or for a partial month if the dates of flow change within month are known)
 3. Forecasted New Bullards Bar reservoir storage
 4. New Bullards Bar forecasted inflow, outflow, diversions, evaporation
 5. Yuba River Index and Water Year classification
 6. North Yuba Index and computation details, North Yuba Water Year classification
 7. Forecasted transfer water quantities (monthly)
 8. Amounts and timing of groundwater pumping contributing to availability of transfer flows.
- 6.3. DWR will provide to Yuba before the 1st of each month from February through June, and from July through January if updated Yuba forecasts are needed, the following information:
- Details of CVP and SWP forecasted reservoir and export operations through the end of the current calendar year.
 - Forecasted periods of balanced conditions through the end of the current calendar year.

7. PROCEDURES FOR ACCOUNTING OF BASELINE FLOWS AND TRANSFER AMOUNTS

- 7.1. **Calculation of Forecasted Baseline Flows.** Yuba will calculate a preliminary forecast of Baseline Flows, as described in Section 3 of this exhibit on a monthly basis unless more frequent forecasted Baseline Flows are requested by DWR or provided by Yuba. The forecasted Baseline Flows along with forecasted flows will be used by DWR to plan Project operations to export Released Transfer Water. The preliminary forecast of the Baseline Flows will be made using forecasted hydrologic conditions for the month, based on Yuba River unimpaired flows forecasted in the most-recent DWR Bulletin 120 and any updates. Within 14 days after the end of the month, Yuba will provide DWR with its draft calculations of Baseline Flows.

- 7.1.1. Yuba will provide preliminary and draft final calculations of Baseline Flows to DWR for its review and concurrence. The calculation of

preliminary Baseline Flows will be used to predict the amount and timing of Released Transfer Water that will be generated for the remaining Water Accounting Year. Yuba will continue to update the preliminary calculation of Baseline Flows as changes in hydrologic conditions affect the accuracy of the calculation. Yuba will provide DWR with all requested supporting information and calculations, excluding any models that were the bases of the calculation of Baseline Flows, so that DWR may verify the calculation. If DWR concurs with the preliminary calculation of Baseline Flows, then such preliminary Baseline Flows will be used in coordinating operations and for any initial allocation of Released Transfer Water as described in Section 8 of this exhibit. Yuba will also provide a calculation of Baseline Storage for Refill accounting (**Exhibit 2**) and comparison with the Baseline Storage Target Line.

- 7.1.2. Due to the delayed release of final USGS reporting of flows at the Marysville Gage, Yuba's transfer accounting will use the mean-daily flows as reported by Yuba to the USGS. DWR will be given timely notice if this information subsequently changes due to re-rating or shifts in the Marysville Gage, as reported by Yuba to the USGS.

7.2. Calculation of Final Baseline Flows and Delivered Transfer Water

Amount. At the time that Yuba develops a preliminary estimate of Baseline Flows and provides it to DWR, Yuba also will develop and provide to DWR a preliminary release schedule and forecast of daily Released Transfer Water. Yuba will update the release schedule and resulting forecast of daily Released Transfer Water no less than once per month, unless an alternative time period is agreed to by the Parties. Within 14 days after the end of each month or within 14 days of an export period, Yuba will calculate a draft final Transfer Accounting under Section 7.2.5 of this exhibit. Section 6 of this exhibit describes the scheduling and coordination of sharing operational information.

- 7.2.1. Because of the variability of hydrologic conditions, Yuba will prepare a forecasted Baseline Flow, a release schedule and the resulting estimated quantities of Released Transfer Water. Yuba will provide indication of the relative probability of Baseline and transfer flows provided.

- 7.2.2. DWR will notify Yuba periodically, as information is available, when Project conditions are such that any of the forecasted Released Transfer Water may not be exported.
- 7.2.3. Calculation of the amount of Released Transfer Water will utilize the Yuba estimated amount of export capacity and the Percent Inflow Diversion Loss, and DWR will confirm these amounts no later than 20 days after the end of the assumed export period. An export period ends following a verifiable point in time at which Baseline Flows can be verified against the Baseline Storage Target Line as described in Section 3 of this exhibit.
- 7.2.4. If DWR concurs with Yuba's draft final calculation of Baseline Flows, then it will become the final Baseline Flows, and will be used for all final transfer accounting for the corresponding period.
- 7.2.5. Along with the calculation of the draft final Baseline Flows, Yuba will also calculate and submit to DWR a draft final accounting of the amounts of Storage Component Water and Groundwater Substitution Component Water that were Delivered Transfer Water during the accounting period. Yuba will first prepare the draft based on initial estimates of exports of Delivered Transfer Water. This draft final accounting will include entries for the following:
- a. Mean daily flow at the Marysville Gage, as measured according to Section 4 of this exhibit;
 - b. Daily schedule of resulting Released Transfer Water according to Section 4.2 of this exhibit and accounting for Negative Transfer Flows under Section 4.4 of this exhibit;
 - c. Calculation of Delivered Transfer Water under Section 5 of this exhibit, including any necessary reductions for Negative Transfer Flows and an accounting of Stored Released Transfer Water delivered and Stored Released Transfer Water remaining in storage;
 - d. A breakdown of the Storage Component and the Groundwater Substitution Component of the Delivered Transfer Water for the period.

- e. A calculation of the amount of reduced storage in New Bullards Bar Reservoir that resulted from releases of Storage Component Delivered Transfer Water. The resulting amount of reduced storage calculated at the start of the Refill Period will be the Base Transfer amount used for Refill accounting as described in **Exhibit 2**.

7.2.6. DWR will review and confirm the estimates of Delivered Transfer Water submitted by Yuba within 20 days after the end of the export period.

8. ACCOUNTING FOR COMPONENTS OF TRANSFER WATER

- 8.1. Water that has been determined to be Delivered Transfer Water will be credited towards one of two components of Water: Storage Component Water and Groundwater Substitution Component Water.
- 8.2. Delivered Transfer Water will be credited to one of these two components of Water.

9. CONFERENCE YEAR ACCOUNTING

- 9.1. No Negative Transfer Flows amount will be accounted for in a Conference Year if there is no Delivered Transfer Water.
- 9.2. Repayment of Refill provisions of the accounting will be suspended during a Conference Year.
- 9.3. If Yuba and DWR agree to transfer some amount of Water in a Conference Year, then the Conference Year Baseline Conditions will be agreed to by Yuba and DWR consistent with the Baseline Conditions detailed in Section 2 of this exhibit.

10. GROUNDWATER SUBSTITUTION COMPONENT WATER

- 10.1. Yuba, at Yuba's sole discretion, may decide to enter into agreements with participating Member Units under which the participating Member Units will arrange for their respective water users to reduce their use of surface water diversions by amounts to be determined by Yuba and the participating Member Units during the Water Accounting Year, and to pump equivalent amounts of groundwater from approved wells as replacement supplies for the Groundwater Substitution Component of Released Transfer Water. Yuba will provide DWR with one or more lists of the locations of the wells that may be pumped for the Groundwater Substitution Component Water, the

selected production wells and the selection criteria used, the Yuba-maintained and the representative monitoring wells. In no case will groundwater pumping commence from a well for the Groundwater Substitution Component Water before approval of the well by DWR. DWR will review the list of wells, their locations and any other pertinent information provided by Yuba and the participating Member Units, and will notify Yuba and the participating Member Units within 10 working days after the submittal of a list by Yuba of any well that DWR reasonably determines is not acceptable for pumping under this Agreement, and will inform Yuba and the Member Unit in which the well is located of the basis for the determination by DWR. Upon receipt of supplemental information from Yuba or the Member Unit in which the well is located, DWR may reconsider its refusal to allow the well to provide Groundwater Substitution Component Water and reverse its determination. Groundwater pumped for the Groundwater Substitution Component Water must be put to reasonable use for irrigation on lands that otherwise would have been served with surface water within the participating Member Unit's service area between March 1 and December 31.

- 10.2. Yuba will comply with the Groundwater Monitoring and Reporting Program, which is **Exhibit 3** to this Agreement.
- 10.3. Yuba and its Member Units will conduct Groundwater Substitution Component operations consistent with the latest Yuba Subbasins Water Management Plan: A Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). The groundwater levels identified for management of Groundwater Substitution Component operation will be consistent with and above the levels identified in the GSP used to ensure basin sustainability.
- 10.4. Yuba will ensure that flow-measuring devices are acquired, installed and maintained to measure the quantities of groundwater actually being pumped for the Groundwater Substitution Component Water from wells identified in Section 10.1 of this exhibit. Yuba and the participating Member Units will be responsible for the distribution of water pumped under this Agreement within each participating Member Unit's boundaries. The Projects will not be responsible for any costs of installing, operating or maintaining groundwater pumping facilities or flow-measuring devices, or for any costs of conveying groundwater pumped to places of use within the participating Member Units' service areas pursuant to this Agreement. By the 15 day of every other month, Yuba will provide a report to DWR of the quantities of groundwater

pumped from each well for the Groundwater Substitution Component Water during the previous reporting period under this Agreement.

- 10.5. Yuba will make arrangements for DWR and its representatives to have access to facilities and records of Yuba and its participating Member Units to the extent reasonably necessary to verify that the groundwater pumping, the management of such pumping and the implementation of the Groundwater Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Groundwater Substitution Component Water meet the requirements of Section 10 of this exhibit.

11. ACCOUNTING PREPARATION AND NOTIFICATIONS

- 11.1. **Accounting preparation for invoicing** - Yuba will prepare a draft accounting of the quantities of Released Transfer Water and the Delivered Transfer Water, utilizing information provided by DWR, as described in Section 7 of this exhibit, and Yuba will submit these calculations in a standard form to be developed by the Parties for review by the Technical Committee according to the schedules set forth in this Agreement. DWR representatives of the Technical Committee will provide written notification to Yuba within 20 days of receipt of the Transfer Accounting from Yuba whether it agrees with the accounting. If the Technical Committee agrees with the accounting, or if there has been no written notification by the 20th day, then Yuba will submit invoices to DWR as provided in this Agreement.
- 11.2. **Disputes on accounting amounts** – If there is a dispute between the Parties regarding accounting, then the Technical Committee will first meet and attempt to resolve the dispute, and submit the disputed accounting for final resolution by the Management Committee. For accounting disputes only, if the dispute cannot be resolved by the Management Committee, then the Parties will resolve the accounting dispute as provided in Section **Error! Reference source not found.** ("Remedies and Dispute Resolution") of this Agreement.
- 11.3. **Maintaining Records of Accounting and Accounts** – Yuba will maintain a set of records for all accountings, and all back-up materials used to prepare the accountings, at Yuba's offices, and Yuba will make these records available to DWR upon request during normal business hours. DWR will maintain records of DWR's determination of Delta conditions and Project export capacity as described in Section 7.2.2 and make these records available to Yuba upon request during normal business hours.

EXHIBIT 2

RESERVOIR REFILL ACCOUNTING PROVISIONS

SECTION 1: GENERAL PRINCIPLES

DWR must be assured that the refilling of New Bullards Bar Reservoir resulting from purchase of water from Yuba by DWR or Third Parties will not impact the Projects. Such impacts could occur (according to DWR) if storage vacated by the transfer is refilled during Balanced or E/I controlled Conditions in the Delta. Yuba agrees that if there is an outstanding account of impacts after the Water Year reservoir refill period, then Yuba will release additional water during subsequent Balanced Conditions in excess of normal operating requirements to compensate for refill impacts. The following procedures for determining refill impacts and conditions for additional releases will be used in accounting for refill. DWR will work with Reclamation to allocate the impact account between the Projects. This exhibit includes the definitions set forth in **Exhibit 1** to this Agreement. In addition, when used in this exhibit, the following terms have the following definitions:

1. "Base Transfer" is the amount of Delivered Transfer Water released from New Bullards Bar Reservoir, as determined by the accounting rules in **Exhibit 1** to this Agreement, and which results in a storage amount in New Bullards Bar Reservoir that is lower than the storage that would have occurred under Baseline Conditions. Calculation of this amount is described in Section 5 of **Exhibit 1** to this Agreement.
2. "Impact Account" is the amount of water DWR would have obtained from the Yuba River in the absence of the transfer releases, but which DWR did not receive due to refilling of New Bullards Bar Reservoir. The amount of Impact Account water will be computed daily during the Refill Period based on Balanced Conditions.
3. "Refill Period" is from October 1 through September 30.
4. "E/I Control" means the export limits identified in SWRCB Water Rights Decision 1641 and may be controlling SWP and CVP exports from the Delta.
5. "Target Storage" is the maximum storage volume during the Refill Period at which Yuba would normally operate New Bullards Bar Reservoir without a water transfer. The Target Storage levels are as follows:

- a. October 1 through October 31: linearly ramped from 705,000 acre-feet to 700,000 acre-feet.
 - b. November 1 through February 15: 700,000 acre-feet.
 - c. February 16 through March 31: linearly ramped from 700,000 acre-feet to 796,000 acre-feet.
 - d. April 1 through April 30: linearly ramped from 796,000 acre-feet to 896,000 acre-feet.
 - e. May 1 through May 31: linearly ramped from 896,000 acre-feet to 966,000 acre-feet.
 - f. June 1 through June 30: 966,000 acre-feet. This Target storage amount of 966,000 acre-feet may be slightly reduced because this amount is the top of conservation storage in New Bullards Bar Reservoir and releases may be made to avoid exceeding this storage amount. The Target Storage reduction will be made when releases from New Bullards Bar Reservoir are increased as storage reaches 996,000 acre-feet which demonstrates filling of the Reservoir.
 - g. During July 1 through September 29, Target Storage must be determined on a case-by-case basis as described in **Exhibit 1** to this Agreement.
- 6. "Actual Storage" is the amount of water physically in storage in New Bullards Bar Reservoir at any time.
 - 7. "Theoretical Storage" is the sum of: (1) Actual Storage on the day specified; and (2) Transfer Account Amount.
 - 8. When Actual Storage exceeds the Target Storage during the Refill Period, there will be no further refill impacts.
 - 9. The accounting procedure in Section 2 of this exhibit will be used to calculate the Impact Account. The general principles in Section 2 of this exhibit will be applied in accounting for any unusual operational conditions not set forth in the application example described below.
 - 10. If the Transfer Amount Account is not zero on September 30, then the remaining balance of the account will be carried forward to the subsequent

water year and the impact accounting will continue until the outstanding balance is eliminated. Exception: If the difference in storage between the Actual Storage and the maximum baseline storage on September 30 is less than the remaining balance of the previous year plus the Base Transfer (see item 1 above), then the transfer amount account will be reset to the difference between actual storage and the maximum baseline storage amount.

11. If there is an Impact Account balance, then Yuba will release water during Balanced Conditions on a schedule that is agreed to by the Parties at a time when such releases will not create or affect deficiencies in local deliveries or instream flows, and these releases will be coordinated with releases for other (if any) water transfers of Yuba. The water released to offset refill impacts will be delivered as Delivered Transfer Water by Yuba and the accounting provisions and refill conditions of this Section will apply to those quantities.
12. By July 31 of each year, the Parties will complete an accounting of the Impact Account.
13. If Project operations effectively reduce or eliminate a refill impact, the Impact Account balance may be adjusted to reflect that reduction or elimination subject to approval by the Projects.

SECTION 2: ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINING NEW BULLARDS BAR REFILL IMPACTS ON THE PROJECTS

The following columnar description sets forth the format, criteria, and procedures to be used for the determination of combined impacts to the Projects due to changes in refilling New Bullards Bar Reservoir caused by the transfer to DWR. An example of the application is attached.

COLUMNAR DESCRIPTION

Column 1 - Date

Column 2 - New Bullards Bar Reservoir Actual Storage at 2400 hours.

Column 3 - Transfer Amount Account (Base Transfer for the year) lists transfer water for which impact accounting is yet to be made. It is the previous day's amount minus the previous day's impact volume. $\text{Column } 3_i = \text{Column } 3_{i-1} - \text{Column } 6_{i-1}$ any transfer amount account remaining after September 30 will be the initial (October 1) amount used in the subsequent water year.

Column 4 - Theoretical Storage indicates the operation of storage as it might have occurred in the absence of the transfer. It is the actual storage plus the Transfer Amount Account. $\text{Column } 4_i = \text{Column } 2_i + \text{Column } 3_i$.

Column 5 - Target Storage is a postulated level of storage, which New Bullards Bar Reservoir might not normally exceed. When Column 5 exceeds this level, it is postulated that the storage would be reduced to the Target Storage amount. The Target Storage is defined as follows: October 1 (705,000); October 2-October 31 (ramped linearly to 700,000) November 1-February 15 (700,000); February 16-March 31 (ramped linearly to 796,000); April 1-30 (ramped linearly to 896,000); May 1-31 (ramped linearly to 966,000); June 1-30 (966,000); July 1-September 29 – determined by hydrology.

Column 6 - Impact Volume indicates daily amounts of water that would be released to achieve the Column 5 Target Storage. $\text{Column } 6_i = (\text{Column } 4_i - \text{Column } 5_i)$ but not less than zero, and not greater than Column 3.

Column 7 - Delta Conditions are determined jointly by DWR and Reclamation in accordance with the COA. A "B" is listed if the Delta is declared to be in Balanced Conditions 3 days after the daily amounts are calculated, a "E" is listed when the Delta is declared to be in excess conditions 3 days after the daily amounts are calculated, and a "R" is listed when the Delta is

declared to be in excess with restricted conditions under E/I control 3 days after the daily amounts are calculated.

Column 8 - Delta Conditions Impact Factor is a factor to be applied to the Impact Volume to determine the Net Daily Impact. The Delta Conditions Impact Factor is 1 for Balanced Conditions, 0 for Excess Conditions and either 0.35 or 0.65 for Restricted Conditions under E/I control.

Column 9 - Net Daily Impact is the daily impact volumes when the Delta is in Balanced Conditions or in excess with restricted conditions under E/I control as indicated in Column 7. $Column\ 9_i = Column\ 6_i \times Column\ 8_i$.

Column 10 - Release to Eliminate Impact Account Balance is the daily amounts of Released Transfer Water Yuba and DWR agree to use for repayment of refill impacts.

Column 11 - Impact Account is the accumulation of Net Daily Impacts and Releases to Eliminate Impact Account Balance.
 $Column\ 11_i = Column\ 11_{i-1} + Column\ 9_i - Column\ 10_i$

ATTACHMENT 3

**ATTACHMENT 3 TO TEMPORARY CHANGE PETITION OF YUBA COUNTY WATER
AGENCY INVOLVING TRANSFERS OF WATER UNDER THE YUBA ACCORD
THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2026**

**Supplemental Information and
Analysis to Support Determinations of No Impacts to Legal Users
of Water or to Instream Beneficial Uses under
Water Code Section 1725**

I. OVERVIEW OF TEMPORARY CHANGE PETITION

This supplemental information is provided to support the petition of Yuba County Water Agency (Yuba Water) under which Yuba Water requests that the Division of Water Rights of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) approve the temporary changes, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 791, et seq., to reauthorize and extend the existing Yuba Accord Water Transfer Program (Water Transfer Program) through December 31, 2026 while Yuba Water's long-term transfer petition to extend that program through the year 2050 (Yuba Accord Extension) is pending.

The transfer water will continue to be diverted by means of the Central Valley Project (CVP) and State Water Project (SWP) Export Facilities, the Freeport Regional Water Project facilities, and the three intakes operated by Contra Costa Water District (CCWD) in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (CCWD's Delta Intakes): (1) Rock Slough Intake, (2) Old River Intake, and (3) Middle River Intake on Victoria Canal, the locations of which are described in **Attachment 1** and depicted in photographs and on the maps in the figures below. As described in **Attachment 1** and depicted on the map in the figures below, additional points of rediversion (PORDs) include San Luis Dam, Pyramid Dam, Castaic Dam and Perris Dam. The specific time for diversion of transfer water will depend on the schedule of transfer water released from the Yuba River Development Project (YRDP), Delta conditions and other operational factors. The figures below generally depict the basin of origin and the area for the transfers including Yuba County, the Yuba River, Feather River, Sacramento River and Bay-Delta, and CCWD's Delta Intakes.

The transfer water will continue to be used within the authorized place of use for Lower Yuba River Accord (Yuba Accord) transfer water, which includes the service areas of the CVP and the SWP, which are depicted in the figures below.

Additional information regarding the proposed water transfer is set forth below in the Project Description section of this document and also in **Attachment 1**.

This document sets forth information to support determinations by the SWRCB under Water Code Section 1725 that the proposed water transfer would not: (a) injure any legal user of the water; or (b) unreasonably affect fish, wildlife or other instream beneficial uses.

II. COMPLIANCE WITH THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

Petitions for temporary transfer of water under Water Code section 1725 are exempt from CEQA pursuant to Water Code section 1729. Moreover, Yuba Water prepared a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the proposed long-term extension of the Water Transfer Program through the year 2050 (State Clearinghouse No. 200506211)(Yuba Accord Extension SEIR), which updated the analysis of the Yuba Accord EIR and all addenda.¹ When Yuba Water's Board of Directors certified the Yuba Accord Extension SEIR in September of 2024, it was determined that there would be no significant or potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the long-term Yuba Accord Extension.² The Yuba Accord Extension SEIR was not challenged. Yuba Water proposes to conduct the Water Transfer Program in 2026 under the same conditions as those evaluated in the Yuba Accord Extension SEIR, except that the program duration would be limited to one year. As discussed below, there would be no significant or potentially significant environmental impacts associated with continuing the Water Transfer Program through 2026.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION - YUBA ACCORD WATER TRANSFER PROGRAM

The Water Transfer Program was implemented in 2008 as part of the Yuba Accord, which was a comprehensive settlement that imposed a set of collaboratively developed, science-based instream flow requirements to protect and enhance fisheries and aquatic resources and improve local and state-wide water supply reliability. The Yuba Accord originally consisted of three separate but related agreements: (1) the Agreement for Long-Term Purchase of Water from Yuba Water by DWR, dated December 4, 2007 (the Yuba Water/DWR Water Purchase Agreement [Water Purchase Agreement]); (2) the Lower Yuba River Agreement for the Conjunctive Use of Surface and Groundwater Supplies between Yuba Water and each of the Yuba Water Member Units³ (the Yuba Water/Member Unit Conjunctive Use Agreements [Conjunctive Use Agreements]); and (3) the Lower Yuba River Fisheries Agreement dated November 5, 2007 (effective March 18, 2008) among Yuba Water, California Department of Fish and Game (now California Department of Fish and Wildlife [CDFW]), South Yuba River Citizens League, Friends of the River, Trout Unlimited, and The Bay Institute (the Fisheries Agreement).

To implement the Yuba Accord, Yuba Water releases water from its Yuba River facilities according to the Yuba Accord's streamflow schedules, as approved by SWRCB Corrected Order

¹ The Yuba Accord EIR and all addenda to that EIR can be found on Yuba Water's website at <https://www.yubawater.org/DocumentCenter/Index/1317>

² Section 1.4 of Yuba Accord Extension Final SEIR, p. 1-2. The Yuba Accord Extension Final SEIR can be found at: <https://www.yubawater.org/DocumentCenter/View/7419/Yuba-Accord-Final-Supplemental-Environmental-Impact-Report-PDF>

³ The Member Units are Brophy Water District, Browns Valley Irrigation District, Cordua Irrigation District, Dry Creek Mutual Water Company, Hallwood Irrigation Company, Ramirez Water District, South Yuba Water District, and Wheatland Water District.

WR 2008-0014.⁴ The Fisheries Agreement, and the instream flow schedule in that agreement, remain in effect (subject to SWRCB's continuing jurisdiction). Corrected Order WR 2008-0014 expressly states minimum instream flows in the Fisheries Agreement must be maintained until SWRCB takes further action to amend the water right order.⁵ Although the Fisheries Agreement will expire by its own terms once a new Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) license is issued for the YRDP, the instream flow requirements will continue to be a term of Yuba Water's water rights permits until such time as SWRCB acts to change them.

The Water Purchase Agreement⁶ established the terms and conditions under which Yuba Water transfers and sells, to DWR and others: (1) stored water that is being released from New Bullards Bar Reservoir that is being released for instream flows on the lower Yuba River; and (2) water from New Bullards Bar Reservoir made available through groundwater pumping by the Member Units in lieu of surface water diversions.⁷ Yuba Accord transfer water is provided from both storage releases of surface water from the reservoir and foregone surface water diversions resulting from groundwater substitution (referred to as conjunctive use). The amount of annual transfer water made available by Yuba Water is based on hydrology, Bay-Delta conditions, the availability of capacity in SWP and CVP export facilities, water year type, groundwater conditions, scope of Member Unit participation, applicable flow schedules (specified by the Fisheries Agreement and the Corrected Order WR 2008-0014), and anticipated SWP and CVP delivery allocations. DWR and Reclamation have separate agreements regarding allocation of these transfer supplies and other related matters, and each has separate individual agreements with their respective contractors regarding water allocation and delivery.

The Water Purchase Agreement, as amended, also allows Yuba Water to transfer and sell up to 10,000 acre-feet/year of Yuba Accord transfer water to a third party (i.e., an agency, entity, or individual other than DWR, a participating SWP or CVP contractor, or a contractor's Member Unit, customer, or landowner) under certain circumstances. Yuba Water also may transfer and sell Yuba Accord water in excess of 10,000 acre-feet/year to a third party when DWR does not elect to take delivery of that water.

Water made available via groundwater substitution is governed by the Conjunctive Use Agreements, as amended, and certain provisions of the Water Purchase Agreement, as amended, which enable the Member Units to pump groundwater as a substitute supply for Yuba Water surface water deliveries in dry years, which allows surface water to stay in New Bullards Bar Reservoir during those years. The conjunctive use program also generates water for transfer under the Water Purchase Agreement. In dry and critical years, DWR and participating contractors will purchase from Yuba Water the surface water made available by the Member Units' use of groundwater as a substitute supply, and Yuba Water will compensate the participating Member Units from the water transfer revenues received from DWR. The Conjunctive Use Agreements require that conjunctive use operations will be consistent with Yuba Water's groundwater

⁴ SWRCB Corrected Order WR 2008-0014 approving Yuba Accord water transfers can be found at https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/board_decisions/adopted_orders/orders/2008/wro2008_0014corrected.pdf.

⁵ Corrected Order WR 2008-0014, p.56.

⁶ The 2007 Water Purchase Agreement can be found at <https://www.yubawater.org/157/Lower-Yuba-River-Accord>.

⁷ Section 2.1.1 of the Yuba Accord Extension Draft SEIR [DSEIR], p. 2-3. The Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR can be found at: <https://www.yubawater.org/DocumentCenter/View/7150/Yuba-Accord-Extension---Draft-SEIR>.

management plan and ensure that groundwater pumping associated with the Yuba Accord will be within the sustainable yield of the groundwater aquifer to safeguard local agricultural, domestic, and municipal wells and groundwater dependent ecosystems and avoid undesirable results under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.⁸

In 2022, Yuba Water, CCWD, and East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) approved the Temporary Water Transfer Option Agreement Between CCWD, EBMUD, and Yuba Water (Water Transfer Option Agreement), which, as amended, allows for potential transfers of some Yuba Accord flows under certain conditions through December 2025.⁹

Between 2014 and 2022, Yuba Water sought, and the SWRCB approved, various temporary and long-term change petitions modifying the Water Transfer Program including: (1) adding Freeport Regional Water Project intake as an additional PORD to enable transfers of Yuba Accord water to EBMUD; (2) adding San Luis Dam as an authorized PORD for the Water Transfer Program; (3) amending the Water Purchase Agreement so Yuba Water can transfer up to 10,000 acre-feet per year of Yuba Accord transfer water to buyers other than participating CVP and SWP contractors; and (4) authorizing a transfer of up to 25,000 acre-feet of water to CCWD pursuant to the Water Transfer Option Agreement and adding CCWD's Delta intakes as authorized points of rediversion under Permit 15026.¹⁰ In approving all of these petitions, the SWRCB expressly required that Yuba Water comply with all other requirements in RD 1644 and Corrected Order WR 2008-0014.¹¹

The existing Water Transfer Program consists of: (1) storage water transfers of up to 200,000 acre-feet per year; (2) groundwater substitution water transfers; (3) rediversion of transfer water at authorized PORDs (SWP and CVP Delta export facilities, San Luis Dam at San Luis Reservoir, Freeport Regional Water Facility, and CCWD Delta intakes; (4) use of transfer water within the SWP and CVP service areas; and (5) use of transfer water for authorized purposes of use including irrigation, domestic, industrial, recreational, fish mitigation and enhancement, municipal, salinity control and water quality control. The existing Water Transfer Program is operated through: (1) the Water Purchase Agreement; (2) the Conjunctive Use Agreements; and (3) the Water Transfer Option Agreement, and will expire on December 31, 2025, consistent with Corrected Order WR 2008-0014.¹²

In its long-term Yuba Accord Extension petition, Yuba Water proposed extending the Water Transfer Program through December 31, 2050, with comparable terms as the agreements described above and in accordance with the terms and conditions imposed in Corrected Order WR 2008-0014 and subsequent Yuba Accord water transfer change petitions approved by the SWRCB. This includes extension of the existing places of use, purposes of use, and points of diversion and rediversion for the Water Transfer Program.¹³

⁸ Section 2.1.1 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 2-4.

⁹ Section 2.1.4 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 2-6.

¹⁰ See Sections 1.2.2 through 1.2.6 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, pp. 1-2 – 1-4.

¹¹ Section 1.2.2 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 1-4.

¹² Section 2.1.4 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 2-6; see also SWRCB Corrected Order WR 2008-0014, bottom of p. 59.

¹³ Section 2.3 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 2-7.

Here, with this temporary change petition, Yuba Water makes the same proposal as described in the pending Yuba Accord Extension petition except that the duration will last a maximum of one year through December 31, 2026. Yuba Water does not seek substantive changes to the Water Transfer Program, other than a proposal to include two additional conditions as detailed in **Attachment 2** to this petition. Otherwise, the proposed terms and conditions are substantially similar to those incorporated into Corrected Order WR 2008-0014, the 2014 SWRCB order approving the Freeport Regional Water Facility intake as an authorized PORD, the 2015 SWRCB order approving San Luis at San Luis Reservoir as an authorized PORD, and the 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025 SWRCB orders approving the three CCWD intakes as temporary authorized PORDs.¹⁴

The terms and conditions proposed in **Attachment 2** are designed to protect against injury to other legal users of water and unreasonable effects to instream beneficial uses, including, but not limited to refill criteria, diversion limits specific to the PORDs, carriage water obligations, a streamflow depletion factor applicable to groundwater substitution water transfers, compliance with other relevant regulatory requirements and water right permits, and continued implementation of applicable mitigation measures identified in the Yuba Accord EIR and Yuba Accord Extension SEIR.

IV. NO INJURY TO OTHER WATER USERS

With certification of the Yuba Accord EIR, approval of the Yuba Accord, and execution of the Water Purchase Agreement and Conjunctive Use Agreements, Yuba Water adopted mitigation measures and made other project commitments to minimize potential impacts associated with implementation of the Yuba Accord.¹⁵ These mitigation measures and project commitments include: 1) limits on refill of New Bullards Bar Reservoir after release of transfer water and related refill accounting provisions; (2) applying a carriage water factor to address water quality and other effects of exporting transfer water from the Delta; and 3) a groundwater monitoring and reporting program.¹⁶

As noted above, the Water Purchase Agreement includes extensive accounting provisions established by DWR, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and Yuba Water to ensure that the transfer water released by Yuba Water from the Yuba River would be new water to the Feather River, Sacramento River and Bay Delta such that legal users of water, including DWR, Reclamation and the SWP and CVP contractors, would not be injured by the transfer of this water.¹⁷ The Water Purchase Agreement and Conjunctive Use Agreement also provide for a Third-Party Impacts Action Plan to respond to impacts to third parties resulting from groundwater substitution pumping.¹⁸

¹⁴ See Section 2.3.2 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 2-10 [describing the prior SWRCB approval of Yuba Water's petitions, except for the 2024 and 2025 transfers that were approved after adoption of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR.]

¹⁵ Section 2.3.6 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 2-11

¹⁶ Section 2.3.6 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, pp. 2-11 – 2-12.

¹⁷ See Exhibit 1 (Scheduling and Accounting Principles) to the 2007 Water Purchase Agreement.

¹⁸ The Third-Party Impacts Action Plan is provided in Section 3 of Exhibit 3 to the Water Purchase Agreement.

As noted in the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, Yuba Water has implemented and is proposing with this petition additional measures to address potential effects of groundwater substitution since the Yuba Accord and related Water Transfer Program were first implemented:

- Yuba Water and its Member Units have implemented a monitoring plan for groundwater substitution transfer as part of the Groundwater Sustainability Plans for the Yuba Subbasins and Yuba Water also has implemented an adaptive management program, referred to as the “Groundwater Pumping Operations Plan” in the Water Purchase Agreement, for future planning of transfers based on the changing conditions of the basin during previous transfers.¹⁹
- Application of a streamflow depletion factor (SDF) to offset the potential effects of streamflow depletion on downstream water supplies due to groundwater substitution transfer pumping is being included as part of the Water Purchase Agreement and Conjunctive Use Agreements.²⁰

Finally, subsequent SWRCB orders approving the modifications to the Water Transfer Program (e.g. the 2014 Order approving addition of the Freeport Regional Water Facility and 2015 Order approving San Luis Dam as authorized PORs, and the Orders from 2022-2025 approving addition of the CCWD intakes as temporary authorized PORs) contain findings that there would be no injury to legal users of water and no unreasonable effects on fish, wildlife or other instream beneficial uses.²¹

Continued implementation of the aforementioned measures and accounting procedures will ensure that any transfer water released from the Yuba River is water that would otherwise not be available to downstream users, and there will be no injury to other legal users of water as a result of this temporary change petition because *all* regulatory requirements of the SWP and CVP would have to be met before Yuba Accord transfers may be implemented.²²

V. NO UNREASONABLE EFFECTS TO FISH, WILDLIFE OR INSTREAM BENEFICIAL USES

The beneficial uses designated by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (2019) for waters within the project study area were identified in the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR.²³ Potential impacts to designated beneficial uses were analyzed in various environmental resource sections of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, most notably including: (1) Surface Water Supply and Management (Section 3.2); (2) Groundwater Resources (Section 3.3); (3) Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (Section 3.4); and (4) Surface Water Quality (Section 3.5). The Yuba Accord

¹⁹ Section 2.3.6 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 2-12.

²⁰ See Term 27 in **Attachment 2** to this Petition; see also Section 2.3.6 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 2-13.

²¹ These various SWRCB Orders can be found at https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/applications/transfers_to_orders/

²² Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 3.2-30 [“Extension of the Water Transfer Program will continue to be subject to all applicable federal and state ESA requirements, including applicable BOs, Incidental Take Permits, water quality control planning, and any other conditions imposed by other regulatory agencies applicable to CVP operations.”]

²³ See Table 3.5-1 in Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 3.5-3.

Extension SEIR analyzed the proposed transfer actions under the long-term Yuba Accord Extension and effects on the physical environment within the Yuba River Watershed, Feather River, Sacramento River and Delta.²⁴ As noted in the Yuba Accord Extension SEIR, Accord transfers improve the water supply reliability for contractors of DWR and Reclamation, *and* for fish and wildlife purposes.²⁵

Like the long-term Yuba Accord Extension, extension of the Water Transfer Program through 2026 is not a new project. Rather, it is a continuation of a component the Yuba Accord, which has been implemented since 2008 and is part of the existing (2023) baseline.²⁶ The analyses conducted in the Yuba Accord Extension SEIR determined that there would be no significant or potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the long-term Yuba Accord Extension.²⁷ Therefore, given that the Yuba Accord Extension would last through 2050 inclusive of the year 2026, temporary extension of the Water Transfer Program for an additional year (i.e. through 2026) also would result in no impact or less-than-significant impacts to all resources evaluated.

Surface Water Supply and Management

The Yuba Accord water transfers reflect existing physical conditions in the Yuba River Watershed and are the baseline environmental conditions, including the resulting conditions under SWRCB's Corrected Order WR 2008-0014 and the modified instream flow requirements in SWRCB Water Rights Decision 1644 (RD-1644).²⁸ Like the long-term Yuba Accord Extension petition, if this petition is not approved, Yuba Water would continue to operate in the same way under the terms of its water rights permits and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) annual licenses until the YRDP relicensing is completed, and would continue to have water available for transfer under certain conditions.²⁹ New Bullards Bar Reservoir would continue to be operated to target maximum storage at 650 TAF, with up to 55 TAF being made available for potential year-to-year water transfers and transfer flows generated by operation to the Yuba Accord instream flows. Yuba Water would also still comply with the instream flow requirements and temperature control requirements which are terms and conditions of RD 1644 as modified by WR 2008-0014 and WR 2008-0025.

Fisheries Resources

The fisheries analysis in the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR³⁰ determined that the Yuba Accord Extension would not result in substantial adverse impacts, either directly or through habitat modifications, to any of the fish species of focused evaluation, designated critical habitat or essential fish habitat in the areas evaluated. Consequently, the Yuba Accord Extension SEIR concluded that, relative to the baseline, extending the Water Transfer Program through 2050 would

²⁴ <https://www.yubawater.org/DocumentCenter/Index/1317>

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ Section 3.1.2 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 3.1-2.

²⁷ Section 1.4 of Yuba Accord Extension Final SEIR, p. 1-2. The Yuba Accord Extension Final SEIR can be found at: <https://www.yubawater.org/DocumentCenter/View/7419/Yuba-Accord-Final-Supplemental-Environmental-Impact-Report-PDF>

²⁸ Section 3.1 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 3.1-3.

²⁹ Section 5.4 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 5-3.

³⁰ Section 3.4 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, pp. 3.4-28 to 3.4-37.

result in less-than-significant impacts to fisheries resources in the Yuba Region, the CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region, the Delta Region, and the CVP/SWP Export Service Area.³¹ Additionally, as stated on page 3.5-16 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, the Yuba Accord is included as part of the integrated CVP/SWP operations that were evaluated by the USFWS and NMFS in their respective Biological Opinions (BiOps) for long-term operation of the CVP and the SWP, which also underwent NEPA compliance review (Reclamation 2019, 2020) and CEQA compliance review (DWR 2020). No new facilities would be constructed or operated as part of the Yuba Accord Extension. Therefore, there would be no construction or operations-related facility effects on special-status fish or aquatic biological resources.

Water Quality

The water quality analysis conducted in the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR was conducted in a similar manner to the analysis of fisheries resources. The Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR determined that, because the Yuba Accord Extension would not involve any changes to Yuba Water's current operation of the YRDP (including flow releases into the lower Yuba River under the Yuba Accord), the Yuba Accord Extension would not change existing water quality conditions, including beneficial uses and existing impairments.³² The analysis also concluded that beneficial uses and concentrations of existing water quality impairments (e.g., mercury, pesticides, dissolved oxygen, water temperature) in the geographic areas evaluated would not be affected by the Yuba Accord Extension, relative to existing conditions. Consequently, with regard to water quality (and designated beneficial uses), the Yuba Accord Extension SEIR concluded that, relative to the baseline, extending the Water Transfer Program would result in less-than-significant impacts to water quality in the Yuba Region, the CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region, the Delta Region, and the CVP/SWP Export Service Area.

Cumulative Impacts

The Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR also acknowledged and analyzed cumulative future changes to the Yuba River Watershed and areas downstream that may occur such as: potential adoption by the SWRCB of the Voluntary Agreements/Healthy Rivers & Landscapes program to comply with an updated Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan; the outcome of the BiOps for the Long-Term Operations of the CVP and SWP; FERC relicensing for various hydroelectric projects in the Yuba Watershed including Yuba Water's YRDP and Narrows Projects, Nevada Irrigation District's Yuba-Bear Project and PG&E's Upper Drum-Spaulding and Lower Drum Projects, among other activities.³³ However, the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR concluded that the incremental contribution of the Yuba Accord Extension would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to surface water supply and management, fisheries resources or water quality in the CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region, the Delta Region, or the CVP/SWP Export Service Area, relative to the existing condition.³⁴

³¹ Section 3.4 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 3.4-35.

³² Section 3.5 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, pp. 3.5-16 to 3.5-21.

³³ See Table 4-1 in the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, pp. 4-3 – 4-17.

³⁴ Section 4.3.1 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, pp. 4-22 – 4-23.


Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems

Regarding potential effects of groundwater substitution pumping on groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs), the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR notes that the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for the Yuba Subbasins “includes a detailed examination of GDEs and the potential for groundwater pumping within the basin, including pumping to support groundwater substitution transfers. The GSP concluded that groundwater pumping for all purposes would be unlikely to affect GDEs primarily because wells in the basin are generally pumping the deeper aquifer, GDEs are supported by shallow groundwater, and “deep pumping” does not impact shallow groundwater conditions.”³⁵

Conclusion


Continuing Accord transfers in 2026 would not result in any changes to Yuba Water operations or Lower Yuba River flows because the transfer water releases from New Bullards Bar Reservoir are already part of the Yuba Accord. Additionally, the proposed transfer would not involve construction of any new facilities and would comply with all regulatory requirements applicable to Yuba Water's water rights. The mitigation measures would continue to be implemented and transfer operations would continue to be coordinated with CVP and SWP operations (in accordance with all applicable regulatory requirements), so that the Delta flow and water quality requirements to protect fish and other beneficial uses of water would not be adversely impacted by the transfers. Therefore, in light of the above, continuation of the Water Transfer Program through 2026 would not result in unreasonable effects to fish, wildlife or other instream beneficial uses.

³⁵ Section 3.3 of the Yuba Accord Extension DSEIR, p. 3.3-15.




Source: Provided by Yuba Water in 2022; adapted by Ascent Environmental in 2022.


Figure 2-2 Major Water Development Facilities in the Lower Yuba River Basin



Map showing Yuba County, the Yuba River, Feather River, Sacramento River and Delta, and the Location of CCWD's Delta Intakes



Enlarged Map Showing the Location of CCWD's Delta Intakes, CVP and SWP Export Facilities, and CCWD's Service Area



Sources: DWR and Reclamation 2016; DWR 2019; adapted by Ascent Environmental in 2023.

Figure 2-3 Places of Storage and Potential Points of Rediversion and Places of Use for Yuba Accord Transfer Water Under the Proposed Extension

Region Map

Pyramid Dam and Surrounding Facilities




**PHOTOGRAPHS FOR PETITION OF YUBA COUNTY WATER AGENCY
TO ADD A POINT OF REDIVERSION TO PERMIT NO. 15026**

Existing Points Of Diversion And Rediversion

(1) New Bullards Bar Dam




(2) Daguerre Point Dam




(3) Browns Valley Irrigation District diversion




(4) State Water Project – Harvey O. Banks Pumping Plant



(5) Central Valley Project – C.W. "Bill" Jones Pumping Plant



(6) Freeport Regional Water-Authority Intake on Sacramento River



PROPOSED NEW POINTS OF REDIVERSION



Rock Slough point of diversion/fish screen on 12/30/2020, looking east



Rock Slough point of diversion/fish screen on 12/30/2020, looking west



Old River point of diversion/fish screen on 5/14/17, looking northwest



Victoria Canal/Middle River point of diversion/fish screen on 1/22/21, looking west



Victoria Canal/Middle River point of diversion/fish screen on 1/22/21, looking east

Places Where Water to Be Rediverted Would Be Used

Examples of Residences within CCWD Service Area

Mohican Way, Antioch



Keller Ridge Drive, Clayton



Julian Way, Pleasant Hill



Kenwood Drive, Concord



Starling Drive, Martinez



Whitman Road, Concord



Typical Examples of Industrial Uses in CCWD Service Area



Contra Costa Regional Medical Center

(R): River View Middle School



Places Where Water To Be Rediverted Would Be Used



Oakland, in EBMUD service area



Typical street in the EBMUD service area



BF Sisk Dam. Credit: Bureau of Reclamation

San Luis Dam – point of redirection, March 2022, looking west



Irrigated lands within Central Valley Project Service Area in Merced County lying between California Aqueduct/San Luis Canal and Delta-Mendota Canal – May 2023.



This aerial view looks north toward Pyramid Dam and Pyramid Lake located on Piru Creek in Los Angeles County. Source: Florence Low – California Department of Water Resources

Pyramid Lake and Dam – point of redirection, May 2022, looking north



Castaic Lake and Dam – point of diversion, May 2014, looking northwest



Perris Lake and Dam and adjacent lands within State Water Project service area – point of rediversion, June 2013, looking northeast

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: Supporting San Francisco's Vintage Small Businesses
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 10:40:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from San Francisco Vintage, regarding vintage shops in San Francisco.

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 Vintage <treasurehunter@sanfranciscovintage.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 2, 2025 6:16 PM
Subject: Supporting San Francisco's Vintage Small Businesses

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm reaching out to share the [San Francisco Vintage Map](#), a new citywide guide I created that highlights more than 90 vintage shops across neighborhoods including North Beach, the Mission, Haight-Ashbury, and West Portal.

These shops are more than retail, they are cultural anchors that preserve history, support sustainability, and drive foot traffic into our neighborhoods. Just as farmers markets strengthen communities around food, this map strengthens communities around design, culture, and small business entrepreneurship.

I'd love to see the Board recognize the importance of these businesses in keeping San Francisco vibrant, unique, and welcoming for both residents and visitors. Even a small acknowledgment or inclusion in city resources would go a long way in supporting these entrepreneurs.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

photo



Krystyl (She/Her)

San Francisco Vintage

Shop Sustainably www.sfvintagemaps.com

Web www.sanfranciscovintage.com

Instagram [@sanfranciscovintage](https://www.instagram.com/sanfranciscovintage)

By APPT Only



From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Letter from Death Penalty Focus regarding File No. 250935, Resolution No. 436-25
Date: Monday, October 6, 2025 9:00:00 AM
Attachments: [Letter from Death Penalty Focus regarding File No. 250935, Resolution No. 436-25.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached for a letter from Death Penalty Focus regarding File No. 250935, Resolution No. 436-25.

File No. 250935, Resolution No. 436-25: Resolution urging Governor Gavin Newsom to use his executive powers to commute the death sentences for all individuals currently sentenced to death in California.

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



*In Special Consultative Status with the UN
Economic and Social Council since 2017*

October 1, 2025

Board of Directors
Mike Farrell
President

Sherry Frumkin
Chair

Linda Fox
Vice Chair

Lawanda Lyons-Pruitt
Vice Chair

Ed Redlich
Vice Chair

Garland Allen
Treasurer

Emily Caesar
Secretary

Reiss Clauson-Wolf
Philip Hansten

Drew Havens

Takehiko Kawame

Alex Kealey

Mark Kimber

Dan Kupetz

Frederic Lusk

Stacy Mallicoat

Robert Myers

Fr. Chris Ponnet

Tracy Rice

Stephen F. Rohde

Robert Sanger

Sarah Sanger

Sarah Timberman

Toni Trucks

Bethany Webb

Charles Windon

Richard Wollack

DPF Team

Yoko Otani-Spudin

Mary Kate DeLuco

Bruce Lisker

Advisory Board

Joan Baez

The Honorable John Burton

Franky Carrillo

David Clennon

James Cromwell

Bishop Joe Morris Doss

Dorothy Ehrlich

Shelley Fabares

Danny Glover

Justice Joseph R. Grodin

Rev. Jesse L. Jackson, Sr.

Kevin Kilner

Rev. James Lawson

Julianne Malveaux

Holly Near

Sister Helen Prejean, C.S.J.

Michael Radelet

Carl Reiner

David W. Rintel

Susan Sarandon

Alan Sieroty

Javier Stauring

Rabbi Lennard Thal

Reverend Cecil Williams

Frank E. Zimring

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

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 OCT 06 AM 08:53
JA BOS-11

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

On behalf of the board and staff of Death Penalty Focus, and our thousands of California supporters, please accept our heartfelt thanks and deep gratitude for the leadership each of you demonstrated in urging Governor Gavin Newsom to act now to commute all death sentences.

Your unanimous vote underscores the profound injustice of this barbaric punishment from its legacy of racial and class discrimination to its conviction and execution of the innocent. Sister Helen Prejean often says, "It is incumbent on all of us to do whatever we can to stop the torture of our fellow citizens," and with your vote last week, your board took a significant step in righting a terrible wrong.

Sincerely,

Mike Farrell
President, Death Penalty Focus
mike@deathpenalty.org

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: BOS File No. 250682 - LETTER OF OPPOSITION: Consolidating the North Beach SUD and NCD and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits
Date: Monday, October 6, 2025 11:15:00 AM
Attachments: [THD Letter to Land Use Committee NBNCD 10.4.25.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Telegraph Hill Dwellers regarding File No. 250682, which is Item No. 19 on today's Land Use and Transportation meeting agenda.

File No. 250682: Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) eliminate the North Beach Special Use District and consolidate certain controls into the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, 2) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District, 3) expand allowable uses in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District, 4) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Nob Hill Special Use District, and 5) reduce limitations on Restaurants and Bars in the Jackson Square Special Use District; amending the Zoning Map to reflect removal of the North Beach Special Use District; 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 under Planning Code, Section 302. (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: Nick Ferris <nicholashferris@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 4, 2025 6:55 PM
To: Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>
Cc: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: BOS File No. 250682 - LETTER OF OPPOSITION: Consolidating the North Beach SUD and NCD and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Committee:

On behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, we are writing in STRONG OPPOSITION to the above-cited legislation. The proposed legislation, as currently drafted, would reverse decades of preservation and zoning efforts by dedicated residents and businesses and greatly diminish our neighborhood.

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers, a neighborhood organization founded in 1954 representing over 500 members in North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northeastern Waterfront, has long been devoted to supporting and protecting small businesses, protecting tenants and existing affordable housing, and seeing that our neighborhood commercial corridors continue to balance tourism with community-serving businesses.

Legislation we have championed over the many years has enhanced variety, limited vacancies, and inhibited the type of real estate speculation that could have cannibalized the most unique, community-serving establishments in our neighborhood.

Request for Continuance

We join with other business and community organizations in requesting that this item be continued to the call of the chair.

This legislation would reverse decades of zoning efforts by our organization. In a joint letter dated September 15, 2025, we asked Supervisor Sauter to continue the Planning Commission hearing on the legislation, scheduled on September 18, to allow THD and the other organizations time to work collaboratively with him to address the concerns our organizations had raised about various aspects of the proposed legislation. He continued the item for only one week.

Although a rough outline of potential amendments to the legislation was provided to us on September 30, 2025, we were advised that the legislation was scheduled for consideration by the Land Use and Transportation Committee just six days later on the following Monday. The legislation has not been drafted by the City Attorney, so has not been available for our

meaningful review and comment to this Committee. We seek a continuance to allow for such review and further discussion with Supervisor Sauter concerning potential amendments.

Comments Should Continuance Not Be Granted

Should our request for a continuance not be granted, we ask the Committee to recommend against the proposed legislation, as currently drafted, for reasons set forth below.

Maintain the North Beach Special Use District (SUD).

We strongly oppose the elimination of the North Beach Special Use District (SUD) and its “consolidation” with the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD). The North Beach SUD, set forth in Planning Code Section 780.3, was carefully designed by the North Beach Merchants Association working with THD to protect and enhance the special character of one of San Francisco’s most important, historic and celebrated neighborhoods. It was enacted to protect residential and commercial uses and use sizes, Legacy Businesses, and the renowned architectural and cultural heritage of North Beach.

Supervisor Sauter’s legislative proposal to eliminate the North Beach SUD -- and to “consolidate” it into the NCD chart in Section 722 – significantly diminishes the intended protections embodied in the NBSUD. We therefore urge the Committee to please reject the proposed elimination of the North Beach SUD.

Retain the Existing Prohibition on Storefront Mergers.

We oppose the proposed amendment to conditionally allow mergers up to 3,000 square feet with a Conditional Use Authorization. Preventing storefront mergers has helped to preserve our vibrant neighborhood, minimize commercial vacancies, and retain small businesses, including our numerous Legacy Businesses, that would have disappeared without these controls. These provisions have long proven successful in protecting the delicate ecosystem of our celebrated neighborhood-serving businesses by incentivizing landlords to retain existing small business spaces that command lower per square foot rents than larger storefronts.

Not only do these small-scale diverse businesses serve our community, but they also attract more small businesses, tourists, and visitors from throughout San Francisco, the region, nationally and internationally, maintaining a healthy balance between tourist-serving and neighborhood-serving businesses. Supervisor Sauter’s proposal to allow storefront mergers is a solution looking for a problem insofar as commercial vacancies in the NBNCD are at an all-time low. For these reasons, we urge the Committee to please retain the prohibition on storefront mergers and reject the proposal to allow storefront mergers in the North Beach

NCD.

Keep the Existing Non-Residential Use Size Limits.

We also strongly oppose Supervisor Sauter's proposed increases in the Non-Residential Use Size Limits in the North Beach NCD from the existing 2,000 square feet to 3,000 square feet. One size does not fit all neighborhoods commercial districts. North Beach has always been characterized by small scale commercial spaces.

Given the small storefronts in North Beach, existing Non-Residential Use Size limit of 2,000 square feet, with a required Conditional Use Authorization for use sizes between 2,000 and 4,000 square feet, has worked and been instrumental in protecting and maintaining a scale of uses and development appropriate to North Beach. The existing use sizes are also largely responsible for the successes of our commercial corridors by preventing the incursion of larger retail uses likely to catalyze rent increases that would result in displacement of our existing businesses. We do not believe this proposed change is necessary or warranted. We respectfully urge the Committee to please reject the proposed increase in the Non-Residential Use Size limit and maintain the upper Use Size limit of 4,000 square feet.

Maintain the Existing Controls for Limited Restaurants.

We also oppose Supervisor Sauter's proposal to allow Limited Restaurant Use as principally permitted for the reasons that follow. The existing legislation was enacted to stem the proliferation of new restaurants and bars that had replaced so many neighborhood-serving businesses in order to achieve a more stable balance of diverse businesses. It has proven a helpful tool in retaining and welcoming non-restaurant uses that make North Beach so special like Biordi's, Jeffrey's, Paparazzi, Knits and Leather, 101 Records, Locali, Macchiarini Creative Designs, and so many more.

The existing NBNCD controls have also helped reduce vacancy rates. Under the existing ordinance, when a space formerly occupied by a Limited Restaurant, Restaurant, or Bar has become vacant, it has been quickly re-filled because it is allowed as of right, while the conversion of other non-eating and drinking spaces is not allowed. Objective surveys of the NBNCD conducted at intervals over the past 40 years show that once a retail space is converted to an eating and drinking use, it rarely if ever reverts back given the expense of converting the space and the resulting increased rent the converted space commands. For these reasons, we respectfully urge the Committee to please maintain the existing controls for Limited Restaurants and reject the proposal to make Limited Restaurants a principally permitted use.

Prohibit the Conversion of Residential to Retail Uses on Upper Floors.

The North Beach SUD currently prohibits the conversion of residential uses to retail uses above the ground floor to protect tenants from eviction and displacement. We oppose the elimination of this control which reflects our long-standing commitment to “no loss of residential units” on our densely populated commercial corridors.

Supervisor Sauter’s amendment, as proposed, was to allow Flexible Retail uses to be principally permitted on all floors in the North Beach NCD. While THD supports allowing Flexible Retail uses on the first floor *only* as principally permitted, we strongly oppose allowing Flexible Retail uses on the upper floors where conversion to retail uses should continue to be prohibited. We therefore urge the Committee to please recommend retaining the prohibition on the conversion of residential uses to retail above the ground floor, including the prohibition on Flexible Retail uses on upper floors.

Maintain Existing Prohibition on Health Care Uses On Ground Floor.

We strongly oppose the proposed amendment to permit new Health Care uses on the ground floor. Supervisor Sauter’s current proposal is to allow Health Care uses up to 3,000 square feet with a Conditional Use authorization, which would permit large facilities such as Urgent Care that would deaden our lively commercial corridors. Under the existing NBNCD controls, these

Health Care uses are now conditionally allowed above the first floor *provided no residential units or tenants are displaced*. We believe our existing prohibition of these uses on the ground floor has worked as intended to maintain our active commercial district. We ask the Committee to please recommend maintaining the existing prohibition on ground floor Health Care uses in the North Beach NCD.

Retain the Requirement for Conditional Use Authorization for Walk Up Uses.

Our opposition to the proposed amendment to change Walk Up Uses from Conditional Use to principally permitted is based on two issues. First, given the mixed-use nature of the North Beach NCD characterized by dense residential uses above ground floor commercial uses, public input is important and Walk-Up uses should continue to be subject to Conditional Use authorization instead of being principally permitted as proposed. Second, we are concerned about the proliferation of “ghost kitchens” and would support an amendment to the Planning Code to define and prohibit “ghost kitchens” in the North Beach NCD and in other NCDs, which are not a beneficial use in any NCD. We ask the Committee to please recommend maintaining the existing Conditional Use Authorization for Walk Up Uses in the North Beach

NCD. In addition, please consider asking the Planning Department to create a new definition and controls for “Ghost Kitchen” Use.

Continue to Exclude the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District from the Priority Processing Program.

Finally, as we stated in our joint letter to the Planning Commission of June 25, 2025, we strongly oppose Supervisor Sauter’s proposed inclusion of the North Beach NCD in the Priority Processing Program from which North Beach, along with the Calle 24 Latino Cultural District SUD, have long been exempted. We are deeply concerned that there is no longer any guarantee that Conditional Use authorizations will be publicly noticed or even receive a public hearing. Planning Department staff explained to the Planning Commission on June 26, 2025, that Priority Processing does not require public notice and may not even need to appear on the Planning Commission agenda as a consent item if the Commission delegates its authority to Planning Department staff. As stated by Planner Aaron Starr to the Commission: “. . . *these projects would no longer be required to be on the consent calendar, so it allows for scheduling flexibility. However, our default would continue to be to have these on the consent calendar unless directed otherwise by this Commission.*” We urge the Committee to please recommend that the North Beach NCD continue to be excluded from the Priority Processing Program.

* * * * *

Thank you very much for your attention. We ask that you consider our comments in your deliberation.

Sincerely,
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Nick Ferris, President

October 4, 2025
Via Email

Myrna Melgar, Chair
Chyanne Chen, Vice-Chair
Bilal Mahmood, Member
Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102



RE: **BOS File No. 250682 - LETTER OF OPPOSITION**
Consolidating the North Beach SUD and NCD and Expanding Allowable Uses and
Use Size Limits

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Committee:

On behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, we are writing in **STRONG OPPOSITION** to the above-cited legislation. The proposed legislation, as currently drafted, would reverse decades of preservation and zoning efforts by dedicated residents and businesses and greatly diminish our neighborhood.

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers, a neighborhood organization founded in 1954 representing over 500 members in North Beach, Telegraph Hill, and the Northeastern Waterfront, has long been devoted to supporting and protecting small businesses, protecting tenants and existing affordable housing, and seeing that our neighborhood commercial corridors continue to balance tourism with community-serving businesses.

Legislation we have championed over the many years has enhanced variety, limited vacancies, and inhibited the type of real estate speculation that could have cannibalized the most unique, community-serving establishments in our neighborhood.

Request for Continuance

We join with other business and community organizations in requesting that this item be continued to the call of the chair.

This legislation would reverse decades of zoning efforts by our organization. In a joint letter dated September 15, 2025, we asked Supervisor Sauter to continue the Planning Commission hearing on the legislation, scheduled on September 18, to allow THD and the other organizations time to work collaboratively with him to address the concerns our organizations had raised about various aspects of the proposed legislation. He continued the item for only one week.

Although a rough outline of potential amendments to the legislation was provided to us on September 30, 2025, we were advised that the legislation was scheduled for consideration by the Land Use and Transportation Committee just six days later on the following Monday. The legislation has not been drafted by the City Attorney, so has not been available for our meaningful review and comment to this Committee. We seek a continuance to allow for such review and further discussion with Supervisor Sauter concerning potential amendments.

Comments Should Continuance Not Be Granted

Should our request for a continuance not be granted, we ask the Committee to recommend against the proposed legislation, as currently drafted, for reasons set forth below.

Maintain the North Beach Special Use District (SUD).

We strongly oppose the elimination of the North Beach Special Use District (SUD) and its “consolidation” with the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD). The North Beach SUD, set forth in Planning Code Section 780.3, was carefully designed by the North Beach Merchants Association working with THD to protect and enhance the special character of one of San Francisco’s most important, historic and celebrated neighborhoods. It was enacted to protect residential and commercial uses and use sizes, Legacy Businesses, and the renowned architectural and cultural heritage of North Beach.

Supervisor Sauter’s legislative proposal to eliminate the North Beach SUD -- and to “consolidate” it into the NCD chart in Section 722 – significantly diminishes the intended protections embodied in the NBSUD. We therefore urge the Committee to please reject the proposed elimination of the North Beach SUD.

Retain the Existing Prohibition on Storefront Mergers.

We oppose the proposed amendment to conditionally allow mergers up to 3,000 square feet with a Conditional Use Authorization. Preventing storefront mergers has helped to preserve our vibrant neighborhood, minimize commercial vacancies, and retain small businesses, including our numerous Legacy Businesses, that would have disappeared without these controls. These provisions have long proven successful in protecting the delicate ecosystem of our celebrated neighborhood-serving businesses by incentivizing landlords to retain existing small business spaces that command lower per square foot rents than larger storefronts.

Not only do these small-scale diverse businesses serve our community, but they also attract more small businesses, tourists, and visitors from throughout San Francisco, the region, nationally and internationally, maintaining a healthy balance between tourist-serving and neighborhood-serving businesses. Supervisor Sauter’s proposal to allow storefront mergers is a solution looking for a problem insofar as commercial vacancies in the NBNCD are at an all-time low. For these reasons, we urge the Committee to please retain the prohibition on storefront mergers and reject the proposal to allow storefront mergers in the North Beach NCD.

Keep the Existing Non-Residential Use Size Limits.

We also strongly oppose Supervisor Sauter’s proposed increases in the Non-Residential Use Size Limits in the North Beach NCD from the existing 2,000 square feet to 3,000 square feet. One size does not fit all neighborhoods commercial districts. North Beach has always been characterized by small scale commercial spaces.

Given the small storefronts in North Beach, existing Non-Residential Use Size limit of 2,000 square feet, with a required Conditional Use Authorization for use sizes between 2,000 and 4,000 square feet, has worked and been instrumental in protecting and maintaining a scale of uses and

development appropriate to North Beach. The existing use sizes are also largely responsible for the successes of our commercial corridors by preventing the incursion of larger retail uses likely to catalyze rent increases that would result in displacement of our existing businesses. We do not believe this proposed change is necessary or warranted. We respectfully urge the Committee to please reject the proposed increase in the Non-Residential Use Size limit and maintain the upper Use Size limit of 4,000 square feet.

Maintain the Existing Controls for Limited Restaurants.

We also oppose Supervisor Sauter's proposal to allow Limited Restaurant Use as principally permitted for the reasons that follow. The existing legislation was enacted to stem the proliferation of new restaurants and bars that had replaced so many neighborhood-serving businesses in order to achieve a more stable balance of diverse businesses. It has proven a helpful tool in retaining and welcoming non-restaurant uses that make North Beach so special like Biordi's, Jeffrey's, Paparazzi, Knits and Leather, 101 Records, Locali, Macchiarini Creative Designs, and so many more.

The existing NBNCD controls have also helped reduce vacancy rates. Under the existing ordinance, when a space formerly occupied by a Limited Restaurant, Restaurant, or Bar has become vacant, it has been quickly re-filled *because* it is allowed as of right, while the conversion of other non-eating and drinking spaces is not allowed. Objective surveys of the NBNCD conducted at intervals over the past 40 years show that once a retail space is converted to an eating and drinking use, it rarely if ever reverts back given the expense of converting the space and the resulting increased rent the converted space commands. For these reasons, we respectfully urge the Committee to please maintain the existing controls for Limited Restaurants and reject the proposal to make Limited Restaurants a principally permitted use.

Prohibit the Conversion of Residential to Retail Uses on Upper Floors.

The North Beach SUD currently prohibits the conversion of residential uses to retail uses above the ground floor to protect tenants from eviction and displacement. We oppose the elimination of this control which reflects our long-standing commitment to "no loss of residential units" on our densely populated commercial corridors.

Supervisor Sauter's amendment, as proposed, was to allow Flexible Retail uses to be principally permitted on all floors in the North Beach NCD. While THD supports allowing Flexible Retail uses on the first floor only as principally permitted, we strongly oppose allowing Flexible Retail uses on the upper floors where conversion to retail uses should continue to be prohibited. We therefore urge the Committee to please recommend retaining the prohibition on the conversion of residential uses to retail above the ground floor, including the prohibition on Flexible Retail uses on upper floors.

Maintain Existing Prohibition on Health Care Uses On Ground Floor.

We strongly oppose the proposed amendment to permit new Health Care uses on the ground floor. Supervisor Sauter's current proposal is to allow Health Care uses up to 3,000 square feet with a Conditional Use authorization, which would permit large facilities such as Urgent Care that would deaden our lively commercial corridors. Under the existing NBNCD controls, these

Health Care uses are now conditionally allowed above the first floor provided no residential units or tenants are displaced. We believe our existing prohibition of these uses on the ground floor has worked as intended to maintain our active commercial district. We ask the Committee to please recommend maintaining the existing prohibition on ground floor Health Care uses in the North Beach NCD.

Retain the Requirement for Conditional Use Authorization for Walk Up Uses.

Our opposition to the proposed amendment to change Walk Up Uses from Conditional Use to principally permitted is based on two issues. First, given the mixed-use nature of the North Beach NCD characterized by dense residential uses above ground floor commercial uses, public input is important and Walk-Up uses should continue to be subject to Conditional Use authorization instead of being principally permitted as proposed. Second, we are concerned about the proliferation of “ghost kitchens” and would support an amendment to the Planning Code to define and prohibit “ghost kitchens” in the North Beach NCD and in other NCDs, which are not a beneficial use in any NCD. We ask the Committee to please recommend maintaining the existing Conditional Use Authorization for Walk Up Uses in the North Beach NCD. In addition, please consider asking the Planning Department to create a new definition and controls for “Ghost Kitchen” Use.

Continue to Exclude the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District from the Priority Processing Program.

Finally, as we stated in our joint letter to the Planning Commission of June 25, 2025, we strongly oppose Supervisor Sauter’s proposed inclusion of the North Beach NCD in the Priority Processing Program from which North Beach, along with the Calle 24 Latino Cultural District SUD, have long been exempted. We are deeply concerned that there is no longer any guarantee that Conditional Use authorizations will be publicly noticed or even receive a public hearing. Planning Department staff explained to the Planning Commission on June 26, 2025, that Priority Processing does not require public notice and may not even need to appear on the Planning Commission agenda as a consent item if the Commission delegates its authority to Planning Department staff. As stated by Planner Aaron Starr to the Commission: “. . . *these projects would no longer be required to be on the consent calendar, so it allows for scheduling flexibility. However, our default would continue to be to have these on the consent calendar unless directed otherwise by this Commission.*” We urge the Committee to please recommend that the North Beach NCD continue to be excluded from the Priority Processing Program.

* * * * *

Thank you very much for your attention. We ask that you consider our comments in your deliberation.

Sincerely,

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

Nick Ferris, President

Land Use and Transportation Committee

October 4, 2025

Page 5 of 5

cc: Myrna Melgar - Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org
Chyanne Chen - Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org
Bilal Mahmood - Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org
Clerk John Carroll - John.Carroll@sfgov.org
Supervisor Danny Sauter, District 3 danny.sauter@sfgov.org
Angela Cavillo, Clerk Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

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, \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan - File Nos. 250700, 250701, 250966
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 12:26:09 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below, from Jason Zhang, regarding File Nos:

[250700](#): Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

[250701](#): Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

[250966](#): General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

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: Jason Zhang <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 7:45 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan

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,

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.

Jason Zhang

jasonz0762@gmail.com

520 Cayuga St

San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Bullock, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 40 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700, 250701 and 250966
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 4:04:00 PM
Attachments: [40 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250700 701 966.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 40 letters regarding File Nos.:

[250700](#): Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

[250701](#): Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

[250966](#): General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

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: [JANIS and BOB HARRER](#)
To: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Dennis Phillips, Sarah \(CPC\)](#); [Tanner, Rachael \(CPC\)](#); [Chen, Lisa \(CPC\)](#); [Andrews, Michelle \(BOS\)](#); [Mary Jane Large](#)
Subject: Land Use and Transportation Committee Meeting on Family zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 2:28:24 PM
Attachments: [BOS Land Use Com 10152025.pdf](#)

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

On behalf of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association, I am forwarding the attached letter to the Land Use and Transportation Committee. The letter provides comments on the Family Zoning Plan, which we understand will be discussed at the Committee's meeting on Monday October 20. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Bob Harrer
BCNA board member



BARBARY COAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

BCNA
PO Box 2045
San Francisco, CA 94126
BCNA@bcnasf.org
www.bcnasf.org

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OFFICERS

Mary Jane Large, Pres.
Marcy Albert, 1st VP
Michele Hennessey, 2nd VP
Philippe Sonne, Treas.
Bill Hannan, Secy.

MEMBERS AT LARGE

David Albert
Bob Harrer
Lee Robbins
James Seff
Diana Taylor

October 15, 2025

Via email

Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place
City Hall
San Francisco CA, 94102-4689
c/o Clerk John Carroll
John.Carroll@sfgov.org

Re: Land Use and Transportation Committee, October 20, 2025 Hearing
Item: Family Zoning Plan

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mahmood:

On behalf of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (BCNA), this letter submits our comments on the most recent September 30, 2025, version of the Family Zoning Plan (the Plan) issued by the Planning Commission and posted on its website. BCNA serves the residents and businesses in the northeastern waterfront along the Embarcadero from Bay Street to Clay Street. The residents of our densely populated, mixed use neighborhood live in a wide variety of housing, including the Gateway, one of San Francisco's largest rent-controlled apartment complexes, the income-restricted Broadway Cove and 735 Davis Street offering housing for families and seniors, the Broadway Family Apartments and the Broadway Sansome complex, as well as an array of market rate condominiums, apartments and flats. In a very real sense, the BCNA neighborhood has been living and exemplifying the announced goals of the Plan for many years.

Backing onto the Embarcadero as we do, our membership takes great enjoyment and pride in our location along one of the nation's, if not the world's, most scenic waterfronts. Since our formation, we have been very active in issues impacting the entire northeastern waterfront, and especially have sought to protect the expansive views and feeling of openness provided by the Embarcadero's unique promenade for both residents and tourists alike. This has included continuing support for the existing 40-foot height limit along the City's waterfront. It is our concern for the protection of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront that leads BCNA to make a very targeted request of the Land Use and Transportation Committee. For the reasons set forth below, we request that the block labeled #4 on the accompanying map be removed from coverage by the Family Zoning Plan entirely and be zoned to exclude the construction of any housing on it.

Our September 9, 2025, initial comment letter to the Planning Commission on the Family Zoning Plan centered on the impact that the July 29 version of the Plan would have had on the triangle of lots bordered by the Embarcadero, Bay Street and Powell Street. We continue to believe, as expressed in that letter, that the best way to protect the unique importance of the Embarcadero is with a firm 40-foot height limit for all housing within that triangle. We appreciate and wish to commend the September 30 version of the Plan on its implicit acknowledgment of the importance of protecting of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront embodied in its:

1. Reduction of the base height for that entire triangle to 40 feet; and
2. Removal of the lots numbered 1-3 on the attached map from coverage by the Plan altogether.

However, we remain seriously concerned about the Plan's treatment of the block labeled #4 on the enclosed map. That block sits directly across the Embarcadero from the major tourist attractions of Pier 39 and the Plaza de California. While we appreciate that the September 30 version of the Plan now lowers the proposed local program height limit on block #4 from 85 feet to 65 feet, we don't believe that is sufficient to protect this unique location. Left unchanged, applying the state program's 100% density bonus to the 40-foot base height in combination with density decontrol could allow a 12-story tower on block #4. Density decontrol is available because it accompanies the block's inclusion in a proposed commercial/mixed use district. We view this as an unnecessary and unacceptable threat to the preservation of the human scale and singular attractiveness of the Embarcadero promenade. A 12-story tower would be a particular affront to, and an unfortunate greeting for, Pier 39 visitors and those arriving at the Cruise Ship Terminal, who come expecting the welcoming human scale and street level ambiance that make San Francisco San Francisco. As the Supervisors are well aware, tourism is a vital contributor to San Francisco's economy and brought in over \$9 billion last year, per SF Travel.

We therefore are requesting that Block #4 be removed from coverage of the Family Zoning Plan and that the construction of residential units on Block #4 be expressly prohibited. We recognize that this request may appear unusual. However, given the impact density decontrol could have on this critical location, and the resultant potential for an inadvertent disadvantage to the local program vis a vis the state program, we fail to see any other approach that will bring the appropriate level of certainty that the future built environment of block #4 will not mar this vital section of the Embarcadero and the waterfront.

There can be no doubt that strong protection of the Embarcadero and the waterfront is of vital interest to all San Franciscans. Starting with public opposition to the Fontana Towers in the early 1960's through the removal of the Embarcadero Freeway to the comments received by the Port of San Francisco in Spring 2024 on its draft Waterfront Resilience Program that "[t]he Embarcadero Promenade is viewed as a critical asset and there is a strong desire to preserve and enhance it", San Francisco voters have made it clear that they do not support development that diminishes access to and enjoyment of the expansiveness of the Embarcadero and its connection to the Bay.

The mantra regarding real estate from time immemorial has been "location, location, location". Real estate is not a fungible asset where one parcel is the functional equivalent of another. For better or worse, the Family Zoning Plan will impact thousands of parcels across San Francisco. But only a very few of those parcels can negatively impact the experience of San Francisco's incomparable Embarcadero. Block #4 is one of those parcels. Mayor Lurie, various members of the Board of Supervisors and other city officials in recent days have stressed that passage of the Family Zoning Plan is the only way for San Francisco to maintain local control over building decisions and to use local knowledge to guide thoughtful residential development. But deciding where not to build also can be an important exercise of local control and knowledge. Protection of the irreplaceable public asset of the Embarcadero and the northeastern waterfront is a value historically held by all San Franciscans, and

we therefore urge the Land Use and Transportation Committee to express that value by removing Block #4 from coverage by the Family Zoning Plan and by prohibiting the construction of any residential units on that block in the future.

We further request this letter be entered into the record of the Land Use and Transportation's October 20 hearing on the Family Zoning Plan. Please contact Bob Harrer with questions or comments on our request and this comment letter.

Sincerely,


BCNA Board of Directors, by
Mary Jane Large, President
maryjanelarge@me.com

Robert Harrer, Former President and Board Member
theharrers@aol.com

cc: All other members of the Board of Supervisors, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Planning Director, sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org
Rachael Tanner, Planner rachael.tanner@sfgov.org
Lisa Chen, Planner lisa.chen@sfgov.org
Michelle Andrews, legislative aide, Supervisor Sauter, Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org

**Family Zoning Plan Zoning Map Ordinance:
Proposed Local Program Height Limits**

September 30, 2025
Supervisory District 3



From: [Kleanthes Koniaris](#)
To: [SauterStaff](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Andrews, Michelle \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: District 3 zoning impact – Bay St. 105-foot height limit
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 7:34:55 PM
Attachments: [Screenshot 2025-10-10 at 18.33.24.png](#)

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

Dear Supervisor Sauter and Colleagues,

I live at 222 Francisco Street in District 3. My building sadly lost a lot of value during COVID that hasn't come back. It still has its north-facing water view, however.

Under the Mayor's proposed *Family Zoning Plan*, parcels directly north of me are slated for **105-foot buildings**. If those are built, my view of the water will be entirely blocked. Based on comparable sales data in similar circumstances, I estimate this would result in an additional **30% loss in property value**. I've attached a zoning map illustrating the issue.

I understand that the intent of the plan is to increase housing, but this **dramatic height increase** seems both unnecessary and harmful to the neighborhood. Developers will naturally build to the maximum allowed height, especially on parcels so close to the waterfront — locking in their own views while everyone south loses theirs. Meanwhile, this area already faces severe transportation constraints (the Embarcadero and Bay Street are chokepoints), so additional density would bring more congestion, less parking, and a lower overall quality of life.

I respectfully ask that you **either oppose the Family Zoning Plan in its current form or amend it to reduce the 105-foot height limit north of Bay Street**. In my case, SB 79 would actually be less damaging.


I believe many of my neighbors share these concerns, and that there is room for a **reasonable zoning compromise** that allows for growth without devastating existing communities.

Best Regards,

Kleanthes Koniaris

222 Francisco Street

San Francisco, CA 94133



From: [Zack Subin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Sunday, October 12, 2025 9:06:15 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,

As a D11 resident, I am excited to see more homes near Ocean Ave to support our small businesses and transit!

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.

Zack Subin
zack.subin@fastmail.fm
192 Caine Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Barbara Heffernan](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 1:22:30 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

That's why the Alliance for Affordable Neighborhoods – a coalition of tenants, small businesses, neighborhood groups, and housing advocates – is calling on you to support a better plan for San Francisco's future.

As a constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:

Build the pipeline without displacement: Use creative financing and local jobs to construct already-approved projects while protecting existing communities.

Landbank public sites: Reserve public land for affordable workforce, senior, family, and community-serving housing, as well as large "soft sites" in high-displacement neighborhoods.

Guarantee real affordability: Increase inclusionary housing requirements, expand rent control, and adopt an Affordability Financing Plan before the next tech boom – including releasing voter mandated funds for affordable housing.

Protect families: Require minimum and maximum family-sized units in designated "family zones" and remove permanent "density decontrol" giveaways to developers.

Protect small businesses and rent-controlled housing: Prohibit demolition without true one-for-one replacement or relocation packages that reflect real costs (including "warm shells"), and enforce a vacancy tax.

San Francisco deserves thoughtful, community-driven planning, not rushed deregulation that repeats the mistakes of the past. I am urging you to work with us to make this a real community plan that delivers housing for families, seniors, and workers.

Sincerely,
Barbara Heffernan

Barbara
California

From: [Allison Ettenger](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Tanner, Rachael \(CPC\)](#); [Chen, Lisa \(CPC\)](#); [Segal, Ned \(MYR\)](#); [Bonde, Aly \(MYR\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: District 8 Resident Supporting Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 11:40:13 AM

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

Hello Supervisor Mandelman,

I recently moved into District 8 with my family after living in District 9 (where I lived for 10 years). We love living in District 8 (Upper Noe Valley) and that we can access Muni lines (the J, 24, 36, and many others) and also can walk to my daughter's preschool and Upper Noe Recreation Center. We nearly relocated to the East Bay this past year due to a lack of suitable housing options. But we're so glad we stayed in SF, and I am looking forward to finding a kindergarten program for my daughter in SFUSD (hopefully at Alvarado or Dolores Huerta) to keep deepening our roots in the community.

I'm writing to ask you to support the Family Zoning Plan which is coming to the Board of Supervisors soon. By allowing small- and mid-scale apartments across more neighborhoods—especially along safe, transit-served corridors—it helps deliver the types of homes families actually use: multi-bedroom units close to childcare, after-school programs, and open space. This is essential to keeping families tied to the community and increases our well-being.

My friends and neighbors (in Districts 8 and 9, both current and former) are following this legislation closely. We are hopeful you and your colleagues can make real progress on the city's housing shortage.

Many thanks for your time.

Sincerely,
Allison Ettenger

From: [Tim Omi](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Segal, Ned \(MYR\)](#); alyssa@talaryabrands.com; [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(ECN\)](#); [commissionstreamlining](#)
Subject: SFCDMA Support for the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 10:33:38 AM
Attachments: [CDMA Letter of Support Family Zoning .pdf](#)

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

Timothy Omi
tim@sfcdma.org
1-415-590-0930
President, San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations
President, Fillmore Merchant Association



Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to inform you that the San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations (SFCDMA) has formally voted to support the Mayor's Family Zoning Plan. After extensive deliberation and numerous conversations with the Planning Department, Supervisors, and Mayors office a majority of our board reached consensus in favor of this important measure.

Back in August, SFCDMA proposed three key additions to the Family Zoning Plan aimed at mitigating small business displacement and reducing the potential negative impacts of large construction projects on our commercial corridors. These corridors form the backbone of San Francisco's neighborhoods — they are where small businesses give our city its identity, culture, and sense of community.

We deeply appreciate the collaborative process that has allowed merchants and community leaders to engage directly with the Mayor's Office and members of the Board. The open dialogue and responsiveness we have experienced mark a positive new chapter in how small businesses participate in shaping city policy.

We are also encouraged that Supervisor Melgar's proposals — including restaurant displacement assistance, expanded buildout support, and an increase to the small business displacement cap — will be incorporated into the plan. Additionally, we urge the City to move quickly to establish a Small Business Displacement Fund in good faith and to implement the incentive for in-kind commercial space replacement within the developer incentive program, as discussed with the Planning Department.

Thank you for your partnership and for ensuring that San Francisco's growth continues to include — and protect — the small businesses that make our city vibrant.

Sincerely,
Timothy Omi
President

San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations

From: [Justin Truong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Saturday, October 4, 2025 10:21:19 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.

Justin Truong
justintruong56@gmail.com
33 Junior Terrace
San Francisco, California 94112

From: natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Natashja Dewolfe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 8:58:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolfe
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Natashja Dewolfe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 8:58:45 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, 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,
Natashja Dewolfe
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, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 9:04:01 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,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: diana.giampaoli@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Diana Giampaoli](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 9:36:42 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): It will not be low income. It will just take away light and bring in more empty storefronts ruining our beautiful neighborhoods. Just making the builders richer and they don't care about anything but themselves. So many empty buildings in SF to fix and house people. Teachers, etc won't be able to afford these buildings.

Sincerely,
Diana Giampaoli
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: esens123@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Erik Sens](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 10:39:01 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Erik Sens
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: symondspaula@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Paula Symonds](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 11:13:16 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.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): As a San Franciscan of 80+ years i know that our city has been known around the world for its jewel like beauty. We can add affordable housing without turning San Francisco into a high rise jungle. We need parks and trees. We do not need towers. We can find ways to add affordable housing using creativity but the bash and burn of our leaders seems to them to be easier. There is no imagination in this plan only ways for the rich to get richer.

Sincerely,
Paula Symonds
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: zano999@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [martin.zanfardino](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 10:23:33 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
martin zanfardino
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: jlzsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [judith zimrin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 10:23:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
judith zimrin
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: PhilD0210@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Phil Dillard](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 11:32:05 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,
Phil Dillard
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: mark.r.berwick@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Mark Berwick](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Monday, October 6, 2025 8:04:52 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Please consider the long term implications of this plan and strongly question the flawed justifications being used to push it through. The consequences of allowing this plan to move forward are huge for residents and the future of the city. From everything I've read, we don't need these more units to comply with the state's requirements (we need to look more closely at what's available), the growth forecasts being used are completely disconnected with reality of our city's growth in recent years (which is actually shrinking), and simply adding units has not proven to be an effective means to improve affordability. Please give this further consideration and diligently review the assumptions, the need and the resulting indelible changes we'll all suffer.

Sincerely,
Mark Berwick
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: gfpedler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Gary Pedler](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Stand With Your Constituents! {Files: 250700, 250701, 250966}
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 10:51:40 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Mayor Lurie's upzoning map is fundamentally flawed. Blanket upzoning will not deliver affordability — it will fuel speculation, displacement, and higher housing costs.

The city needs more time to get this right. Rushing a permanent land use change without full public awareness is reckless and unacceptable.

As the largest rezoning and wealth redistribution in San Francisco's history, I urge you to withhold support unless the map is significantly revised to reflect your constituents' concerns.

As passed by the Planning Commission, the plan would 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: [Jared Boot-Haury](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:25:56 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.

Jared Boot-Haury
jwboot3@icloud.com
351 King St, Unit 122
San Francisco, California 94158

From: [Derek Gendvil](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:27:47 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.

Derek Gendvil
dgendvil@gmail.com
9030 W. Sahara Ave. #360
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117

From: [Sandy Carter](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:36:36 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.

Sandy Carter
carters989@gmail.com
740 Anza Street
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Noah Garcia](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:38:52 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.

Noah Garcia (D5 Resident)

Noah Garcia
noahgarcia80@gmail.com
564 Fell St
San Francisco, California 94102

From: [Samah Shah](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 6:53:06 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.

I've lived in the Richmond of 6 years and this neighbourhood especially urgently needs more homes. We have not built enough housing for our residents and the people who work here, but this plan finally 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.

Samah Shah
samahsemail@gmail.com
1732 Anza St Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Casey Frost](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:02:32 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.

Casey Frost
caseyfrost13@gmail.com
111 Monterey Blvd
San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Leah Loversky](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:22:15 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.

Leah Loversky
ldloversky@gmail.com
1207 CHESTNUT ST APT 10
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Mark Goldberg](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:27:26 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.

Mark Goldberg
mark.goldbergsf@gmail.com
2362 Bay Street
San Francisco, California 94123

From: [Teresa Dal Santo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:30:50 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.

Teresa Dal Santo
dalsantot@gmail.com
2031 Powell Street,
San Francisco, California 94133

From: teeeets@gmail.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:42:55 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.

teeeets@gmail.com
838 Anza St
Sf, California 94118

From: [Anthony Criscione](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 8:42:39 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.

Anthony Criscione
acriscione1997@gmail.com
145 San Jose Avenue
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Justin Truong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 11:23:52 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.

Justin Truong
justintruong56@gmail.com
33 Junior Terrace
San Francisco, California 94112

From: shsetterfield@gmail.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 11:59:21 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.

shsetterfield@gmail.com
88 Hoff St, #206
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [John Steponaitis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 12:54:31 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.

John Steponaitis
steponaj@gmail.com
910 Geary 20
San Francisco, California 94109-7095

From: [Shane Booth](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 6:52:46 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.

Shane Booth
shanerama@gmail.com
112 Delano Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Patrick Le](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 8:03:09 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.

Patrick Le
patrickle1994@gmail.com
511 Eureka St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [James Lemaire](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 9:22:20 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.

James Lemaire
james.roderick.lemaire@gmail.com
3685 17th St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Irene Koo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 10:36:03 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,

As a resident of D1 Inner Richmond, I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. I especially hope my own Supervisor Connie Chan hears our voices in support of this 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.

I imagine raising a family here in SF, and I'd love for it to be in the Inner Richmond and in a city where the Family Zoning Plan is making the city we love, even better.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Irene Koo
irenekoo08@gmail.com
157 8th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Brandon Jackson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 8:11:21 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. I live South of Market, and by far the majority of housing built in recent decades in San Francisco has been around my neighborhood. But much of this housing is not suitable for families or mixed-age households.

Meanwhile, the west side of the city has built very little housing in recent decades, and has continually resisted even modest proposals to increase housing. We do not need drastic upzoning of the west side in order to improve this situation. The changes proposed in the Family Zoning Plan will go a long way to achieving this goal, and I urge you to support this for the benefit of ALL San Franciscans.

Respectfully,
Brandon Jackson

Brandon Jackson
brandonmjackson77@gmail.com
68 Harriet Street, Unit 7
San Francisco, California 94103

From: [Westside Observer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Lurie's Zoning Plan • Streamlining's Double-Cross • 29-Sunset Bus Line • Zoo's Fundraiser • Diamond Heights Tower
• High School Hookey •
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 9:58:26 AM

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





A Future for Westside Neighborhoods?

Six Fatal Flaws in Lurie's Rezoning Plan

The recall of Engardio sent shock waves through Lurie's supporters on the Board of Supervisors — Sherrill (Marina), Sauter (North Beach, Chinatown), and Melgar in District 7 — face large-scale opposition to the proposal.


The Planning Commission passed the proposal on a 4-3 vote. Its failure to get one vote from any of the supervisor-appointed commissioners shows the distinctly partisan character of the proposal.

The growing opposition to the proposal was starkly shown at a press

conference the same day when Lurie was booed for extended periods during his remarks.

by Calvin Welch

[Read More](#)



Move Fast — Break Things?


Voters Double-Crossed at Commission Streamlining Task Force

Hey Task Force — Prop D LOST. Implement Prop. E! It Won.

Weakening commissions is precisely what the Task Force is doing to hand Mayor Lurie more strong mayor authority. While it was supposed to be a "hedge" against a "strong mayor" the Task Force recommends implementing the opposite.

by Patrick Monette-Shaw

[Read More](#)



Navy's Final Insult

Plan to "Explode" Toxic Site Endangers Neighbors


The Navy exhibits poor behavior. Can we really trust their judgment that the buildings located on Parcel G are safe for demolition by explosion?

An explosion will create a dust cloud that will impact the Palou Avenue neighborhood, with playgrounds, schools, churches and transit lines. And worse, the toxic debris must be removed — traveling down numerous side streets to Third Street, exposing all those passing by to heavily poisonous dust.

by Glenn Rogers

[Read More](#)






Planners want to eliminate 12 stops for SF's longest bus route

Makeover for 29-Sunset Line

The 29-Sunset bus line, notorious for being jampacked with students heading to and from school, may soon get some much-needed help. SFMTA wants to remove bus stops at a dozen intersections that do not meet standards—800 feet minimum distance between stops.

by Jason Chinn

[Read More](#)



More Information





City's planners approve 104-foot tower in Diamond Heights despite broad community opposition.

Neighborhood Finds It Hard to Battle AT&T

The final vote was typical of the Planning Commission today: four Mayoral appointees voted yes. All three Supes appointees voted no


The "monopole" would soar over existing trees and create a major new element on the skyline in a part of town where most construction is limited to four stories.

The neighborhood was organized, and speakers at the commission meeting were 100 percent against the proposal (although 13 people in

the neighborhood wrote to support the plan, with 83 opposed). Speakers noted that the tower would be an eyesore—but also a potential fire threat.

by **Tim Redmond**

[Read More](#)



Moving captive wild animals such as gorillas, like Cecil, across the country continues the cycle of artificial, high-stakes social manipulation

Animal Rights Activists Cold-Shoulder Zoo's Gala Fundraiser

Behind the feel-good PR lies a disturbing truth says Barker. This isn't about animal welfare. It's about control, breeding quotas, and the illusion of progress


The Zoo is eagerly preparing for its annual Gala Fundraiser this October 18. The recent arrival of newest resident Cecil the Zoo's new male silverback Western lowland gorilla, is in the spotlight.

He was born at the Cincinnati Zoo in Ohio. His arrival in San Francisco at 27 years old marks his third place of residence within a zoo establishment.

by Jonathan Farrell

[Read More](#)





Truency Is A Serious Problem for California Schools

In the 2024–25, SFUSD students lost an estimated 4.4 million hours of learning and SFUSD lost over \$60 million in state funding due to student absences. In California, school funding is based on attendance. If a student does not show up, the district loses money.

by Carol Kocivar

[Read More](#)





Earthquake Brace + Bolt program *Extended*

CRMP EXTENDS EARTHQUAKE GRANT APPLICATION DEADLINE

Extension through October 17 aligns with California Great ShakeOut to boost earthquake preparedness awareness. Grants of up to \$3000 are available for eligible homeowners in our area.

Sign Up





The Things That Make Us Grumpy

Quinten expands on the recall of Supervisor Joel Engardio, Prop 50, even Trump's announcement last month that he would award one-time mayor Rudy Giuliani the highest US civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Honor.

[Read More](#)





[PLEASE SUPPORT LOCAL NEWS REPORTING!](#)

Got an opposing view? We seek to represent all sides of the discussion.

[Your Feedback Is Welcome](#)





Please subscribe! Subscription is Free

But as a Sustaining Subscriber at \$5 a month, we'll make your 16¢ a day go a long way! Or become a benefactor. We count on you to keep us online

— thanks!

[Subscribe / Donate](#)

The Westside is blessed with all kinds of opinions. We try to show all sides of a question. Got an opposing position? [Let us know](#). We're here for you.



Copyright © 2025 Westside San Francisco Media, All rights reserved.

You are receiving this email because you opted in via our website.

Our mailing address is:

Westside San Francisco Media
PO Box 170524
San Francisco, CA 94117-0524

[Add us to your address book](#)

Want to change how you receive these emails?
You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#).



From: johnpmurray415@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [John Murray](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:09:15 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 Murray
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, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 5:22:57 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,
Senta Tsantilis

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. 250851 San Francisco Street Safety Act - 10 letters
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 12:48:46 PM
Attachments: [10 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 10 letters, from members of the public regarding:

File No. 250851, Resolution No. 437-25 - 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.

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) 554-5184 | 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 Lozynsky](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 7:35:26 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 and Mayor

From your constituent John Lozynsky

Email johnlozy@yahoo.com

Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!

Message:

Dear Supervisor,

I'm disappointed that you did not incorporate critical balancing amendments to the "Street Safety Act," or, more commonly known as Vision Zero 2.0. Please bring these ideas to the table as a separate resolution.

As written the Street Safety Act is not about safety and will not achieve that goal. It is also onerous and oppressive to the majority of San Franciscans.

Proposed RECITALS:

WHEREAS, The streets of San Francisco are used by all San Franciscans for all modes of transportation, including but not limited to, walking, scootering, bicycling, motorcycling, driving, and public transit; and

WHEREAS The use of city streets inevitably involves some unavoidable risk; and

WHEREAS All users of city streets share in the responsibility for their own safety, as well as for conducting themselves in a manner safe for themselves and others; and

WHEREAS Street design involves unavoidable tradeoffs that should balance the efficacy of the

various transportation modes; and

WHEREAS All users of San Francisco streets have a legitimate expectation that their use will be facilitated, including drivers of motor vehicles, and not unreasonably impeded, complicated, or disadvantaged; and

WHEREAS More than half of the pedestrian, bicycle, and personal conveyance deaths on San Francisco streets in the last three years were preventable by the deceased by following existing traffic laws; and

WHEREAS San Francisco's surface street traffic moved at the second slowest average speed in the country in 2024 at 14 mph; and

Proposed RESOLUTIONS:

Be it RESOLVED, That all decisions involving street design shall be made with balanced consideration to the needs of all transportation modes; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That all street redesign projects that are significant, including but not limited to, speed limit reductions, speed hump installations, removal of a traffic lane, removal of parking spaces, and significant reconfiguration of traffic flow, shall require a cost/benefit review and report from an outside firm nationally recognized to be a non-partisan engineering expert in such matters, retained and managed by the San Francisco Controller's office; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED That the SFMTA shall identify the core motor vehicle traffic corridors throughout the city, shall prioritize these corridors for motor vehicle traffic, and shall publish a report by December 2026 outlining prioritized projects to increase traffic throughput on these corridors with the goal of average motor vehicle speeds of no less than 5mph lower than currently posted speeds; this report and project shall be given no less prominence, time, attention, budget, and priority than the Biking and Rolling Plan, the Northstar Network, and Vision Zero (and related programs) plans, reports, and activities.

Sincerely,

From: [Dennis Richards](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 8:10:39 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Dennis Richards

Email drichards20@outlook.com

Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!

Message:

Dear Supervisor,

I'm disappointed that you did not incorporate critical balancing amendments to the "Street Safety Act," or, more commonly known as Vision Zero 2.0. Please bring these ideas to the table as a separate resolution.

As written the Street Safety Act is not about safety and will not achieve that goal. It is also onerous and oppressive to the majority of San Franciscans.

Proposed RECITALS:

WHEREAS, The streets of San Francisco are used by all San Franciscans for all modes of transportation, including but not limited to, walking, scootering, bicycling, motorcycling, driving, and public transit; and

WHEREAS The use of city streets inevitably involves some unavoidable risk; and

WHEREAS All users of city streets share in the responsibility for their own safety, as well as for conducting themselves in a manner safe for themselves and others; and

WHEREAS Street design involves unavoidable tradeoffs that should balance the efficacy of the

various transportation modes; and

WHEREAS All users of San Francisco streets have a legitimate expectation that their use will be facilitated, including drivers of motor vehicles, and not unreasonably impeded, complicated, or disadvantaged; and

WHEREAS More than half of the pedestrian, bicycle, and personal conveyance deaths on San Francisco streets in the last three years were preventable by the deceased by following existing traffic laws; and

WHEREAS San Francisco's surface street traffic moved at the second slowest average speed in the country in 2024 at 14 mph; and

Proposed RESOLUTIONS:

Be it RESOLVED, That all decisions involving street design shall be made with balanced consideration to the needs of all transportation modes; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That all street redesign projects that are significant, including but not limited to, speed limit reductions, speed hump installations, removal of a traffic lane, removal of parking spaces, and significant reconfiguration of traffic flow, shall require a cost/benefit review and report from an outside firm nationally recognized to be a non-partisan engineering expert in such matters, retained and managed by the San Francisco Controller's office; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED That the SFMTA shall identify the core motor vehicle traffic corridors throughout the city, shall prioritize these corridors for motor vehicle traffic, and shall publish a report by December 2026 outlining prioritized projects to increase traffic throughput on these corridors with the goal of average motor vehicle speeds of no less than 5mph lower than currently posted speeds; this report and project shall be given no less prominence, time, attention, budget, and priority than the Biking and Rolling Plan, the Northstar Network, and Vision Zero (and related programs) plans, reports, and activities.

Sincerely,

From: [Eugene Galvin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 9:28:26 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 and Mayor

From your constituent Eugene Galvin

Email eggalvin@hotmail.com

Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!

Message:

Dear Supervisor,

I'm disappointed that you did not incorporate critical balancing amendments to the "Street Safety Act," or, more commonly known as Vision Zero 2.0. Please bring these ideas to the table as a separate resolution.

As written the Street Safety Act is not about safety and will not achieve that goal. It is also onerous and oppressive to the majority of San Franciscans.

Proposed RECITALS:

WHEREAS, The streets of San Francisco are used by all San Franciscans for all modes of transportation, including but not limited to, walking, scootering, bicycling, motorcycling, driving, and public transit; and

WHEREAS The use of city streets inevitably involves some unavoidable risk; and

WHEREAS All users of city streets share in the responsibility for their own safety, as well as for conducting themselves in a manner safe for themselves and others; and

WHEREAS Street design involves unavoidable tradeoffs that should balance the efficacy of the

various transportation modes; and

WHEREAS All users of San Francisco streets have a legitimate expectation that their use will be facilitated, including drivers of motor vehicles, and not unreasonably impeded, complicated, or disadvantaged; and

WHEREAS More than half of the pedestrian, bicycle, and personal conveyance deaths on San Francisco streets in the last three years were preventable by the deceased by following existing traffic laws; and

WHEREAS San Francisco's surface street traffic moved at the second slowest average speed in the country in 2024 at 14 mph; and

Proposed RESOLUTIONS:

Be it RESOLVED, That all decisions involving street design shall be made with balanced consideration to the needs of all transportation modes; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That all street redesign projects that are significant, including but not limited to, speed limit reductions, speed hump installations, removal of a traffic lane, removal of parking spaces, and significant reconfiguration of traffic flow, shall require a cost/benefit review and report from an outside firm nationally recognized to be a non-partisan engineering expert in such matters, retained and managed by the San Francisco Controller's office; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED That the SFMTA shall identify the core motor vehicle traffic corridors throughout the city, shall prioritize these corridors for motor vehicle traffic, and shall publish a report by December 2026 outlining prioritized projects to increase traffic throughput on these corridors with the goal of average motor vehicle speeds of no less than 5mph lower than currently posted speeds; this report and project shall be given no less prominence, time, attention, budget, and priority than the Biking and Rolling Plan, the Northstar Network, and Vision Zero (and related programs) plans, reports, and activities.

Sincerely,

From: [William Hickey](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 12:01:38 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 and Mayor

From your constituent William Hickey

Email whickey31113@proton.me

Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!

Message:

Dear Supervisor,

I'm disappointed that you did not incorporate critical balancing amendments to the "Street Safety Act," or, more commonly known as Vision Zero 2.0. Please bring these ideas to the table as a separate resolution.

As written the Street Safety Act is not about safety and will not achieve that goal. It is also onerous and oppressive to the majority of San Franciscans.

Proposed RECITALS:

WHEREAS, The streets of San Francisco are used by all San Franciscans for all modes of transportation, including but not limited to, walking, scootering, bicycling, motorcycling, driving, and public transit; and

WHEREAS The use of city streets inevitably involves some unavoidable risk; and

WHEREAS All users of city streets share in the responsibility for their own safety, as well as for conducting themselves in a manner safe for themselves and others; and

WHEREAS Street design involves unavoidable tradeoffs that should balance the efficacy of the

various transportation modes; and

WHEREAS All users of San Francisco streets have a legitimate expectation that their use will be facilitated, including drivers of motor vehicles, and not unreasonably impeded, complicated, or disadvantaged; and

WHEREAS More than half of the pedestrian, bicycle, and personal conveyance deaths on San Francisco streets in the last three years were preventable by the deceased by following existing traffic laws; and

WHEREAS San Francisco's surface street traffic moved at the second slowest average speed in the country in 2024 at 14 mph; and

Proposed RESOLUTIONS:

Be it RESOLVED, That all decisions involving street design shall be made with balanced consideration to the needs of all transportation modes; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That all street redesign projects that are significant, including but not limited to, speed limit reductions, speed hump installations, removal of a traffic lane, removal of parking spaces, and significant reconfiguration of traffic flow, shall require a cost/benefit review and report from an outside firm nationally recognized to be a non-partisan engineering expert in such matters, retained and managed by the San Francisco Controller's office; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED That the SFMTA shall identify the core motor vehicle traffic corridors throughout the city, shall prioritize these corridors for motor vehicle traffic, and shall publish a report by December 2026 outlining prioritized projects to increase traffic throughput on these corridors with the goal of average motor vehicle speeds of no less than 5mph lower than currently posted speeds; this report and project shall be given no less prominence, time, attention, budget, and priority than the Biking and Rolling Plan, the Northstar Network, and Vision Zero (and related programs) plans, reports, and activities.

Sincerely,

From: [Micahel Regan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 6:23:46 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 and Mayor

From your constituent Micahel Regan

Email myoldgoat@yahoo.com

Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!

Message:

Dear Supervisor,

I'm disappointed that you did not incorporate critical balancing amendments to the "Street Safety Act," or, more commonly known as Vision Zero 2.0. Please bring these ideas to the table as a separate resolution.

As written the Street Safety Act is not about safety and will not achieve that goal. It is also onerous and oppressive to the majority of San Franciscans.

Proposed RECITALS:

WHEREAS, The streets of San Francisco are used by all San Franciscans for all modes of transportation, including but not limited to, walking, scootering, bicycling, motorcycling, driving, and public transit; and

WHEREAS The use of city streets inevitably involves some unavoidable risk; and

WHEREAS All users of city streets share in the responsibility for their own safety, as well as for conducting themselves in a manner safe for themselves and others; and

WHEREAS Street design involves unavoidable tradeoffs that should balance the efficacy of the

various transportation modes; and

WHEREAS All users of San Francisco streets have a legitimate expectation that their use will be facilitated, including drivers of motor vehicles, and not unreasonably impeded, complicated, or disadvantaged; and

WHEREAS More than half of the pedestrian, bicycle, and personal conveyance deaths on San Francisco streets in the last three years were preventable by the deceased by following existing traffic laws; and

WHEREAS San Francisco's surface street traffic moved at the second slowest average speed in the country in 2024 at 14 mph; and

Proposed RESOLUTIONS:

Be it RESOLVED, That all decisions involving street design shall be made with balanced consideration to the needs of all transportation modes; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That all street redesign projects that are significant, including but not limited to, speed limit reductions, speed hump installations, removal of a traffic lane, removal of parking spaces, and significant reconfiguration of traffic flow, shall require a cost/benefit review and report from an outside firm nationally recognized to be a non-partisan engineering expert in such matters, retained and managed by the San Francisco Controller's office; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED That the SFMTA shall identify the core motor vehicle traffic corridors throughout the city, shall prioritize these corridors for motor vehicle traffic, and shall publish a report by December 2026 outlining prioritized projects to increase traffic throughput on these corridors with the goal of average motor vehicle speeds of no less than 5mph lower than currently posted speeds; this report and project shall be given no less prominence, time, attention, budget, and priority than the Biking and Rolling Plan, the Northstar Network, and Vision Zero (and related programs) plans, reports, and activities.

Sincerely,

From: [Paul Mohun](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 9:45:31 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 and Mayor

From your constituent Paul Mohun

Email prm5@georgetown.esu

Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!

Message:

Dear Supervisor,

I'm disappointed that you did not incorporate critical balancing amendments to the "Street Safety Act," or, more commonly known as Vision Zero 2.0. Please bring these ideas to the table as a separate resolution.

As written the Street Safety Act is not about safety and will not achieve that goal. It is also onerous and oppressive to the majority of San Franciscans.

Proposed RECITALS:

WHEREAS, The streets of San Francisco are used by all San Franciscans for all modes of transportation, including but not limited to, walking, scootering, bicycling, motorcycling, driving, and public transit; and

WHEREAS The use of city streets inevitably involves some unavoidable risk; and

WHEREAS All users of city streets share in the responsibility for their own safety, as well as for conducting themselves in a manner safe for themselves and others; and

WHEREAS Street design involves unavoidable tradeoffs that should balance the efficacy of the

various transportation modes; and

WHEREAS All users of San Francisco streets have a legitimate expectation that their use will be facilitated, including drivers of motor vehicles, and not unreasonably impeded, complicated, or disadvantaged; and

WHEREAS More than half of the pedestrian, bicycle, and personal conveyance deaths on San Francisco streets in the last three years were preventable by the deceased by following existing traffic laws; and

WHEREAS San Francisco's surface street traffic moved at the second slowest average speed in the country in 2024 at 14 mph; and

Proposed RESOLUTIONS:

Be it RESOLVED, That all decisions involving street design shall be made with balanced consideration to the needs of all transportation modes; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That all street redesign projects that are significant, including but not limited to, speed limit reductions, speed hump installations, removal of a traffic lane, removal of parking spaces, and significant reconfiguration of traffic flow, shall require a cost/benefit review and report from an outside firm nationally recognized to be a non-partisan engineering expert in such matters, retained and managed by the San Francisco Controller's office; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED That the SFMTA shall identify the core motor vehicle traffic corridors throughout the city, shall prioritize these corridors for motor vehicle traffic, and shall publish a report by December 2026 outlining prioritized projects to increase traffic throughput on these corridors with the goal of average motor vehicle speeds of no less than 5mph lower than currently posted speeds; this report and project shall be given no less prominence, time, attention, budget, and priority than the Biking and Rolling Plan, the Northstar Network, and Vision Zero (and related programs) plans, reports, and activities.

Sincerely,

From: [Cynthia Brown](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!
Date: Saturday, October 4, 2025 9:17:28 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 and Mayor

From your constituent Cynthia Brown

Email cymphany@hotmail.com

Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!

Message:

Dear Supervisor,

I'm disappointed that you did not incorporate critical balancing amendments to the "Street Safety Act," or, more commonly known as Vision Zero 2.0. Please bring these ideas to the table as a separate resolution.

As written the Street Safety Act is not about safety and will not achieve that goal. It is also onerous and oppressive to the majority of San Franciscans.

Proposed RECITALS:

WHEREAS, The streets of San Francisco are used by all San Franciscans for all modes of transportation, including but not limited to, walking, scootering, bicycling, motorcycling, driving, and public transit; and

WHEREAS The use of city streets inevitably involves some unavoidable risk; and

WHEREAS All users of city streets share in the responsibility for their own safety, as well as for conducting themselves in a manner safe for themselves and others; and

WHEREAS Street design involves unavoidable tradeoffs that should balance the efficacy of the

various transportation modes; and

WHEREAS All users of San Francisco streets have a legitimate expectation that their use will be facilitated, including drivers of motor vehicles, and not unreasonably impeded, complicated, or disadvantaged; and

WHEREAS More than half of the pedestrian, bicycle, and personal conveyance deaths on San Francisco streets in the last three years were preventable by the deceased by following existing traffic laws; and

WHEREAS San Francisco's surface street traffic moved at the second slowest average speed in the country in 2024 at 14 mph; and

Proposed RESOLUTIONS:

Be it RESOLVED, That all decisions involving street design shall be made with balanced consideration to the needs of all transportation modes; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That all street redesign projects that are significant, including but not limited to, speed limit reductions, speed hump installations, removal of a traffic lane, removal of parking spaces, and significant reconfiguration of traffic flow, shall require a cost/benefit review and report from an outside firm nationally recognized to be a non-partisan engineering expert in such matters, retained and managed by the San Francisco Controller's office; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED That the SFMTA shall identify the core motor vehicle traffic corridors throughout the city, shall prioritize these corridors for motor vehicle traffic, and shall publish a report by December 2026 outlining prioritized projects to increase traffic throughput on these corridors with the goal of average motor vehicle speeds of no less than 5mph lower than currently posted speeds; this report and project shall be given no less prominence, time, attention, budget, and priority than the Biking and Rolling Plan, the Northstar Network, and Vision Zero (and related programs) plans, reports, and activities.

Sincerely,

From: [Marna Armstead](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 3:28:26 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 and Mayor

From your constituent Marna Armstead

Email marnaarmstead@gmail.com

Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!

Message:

Dear Supervisor,

I'm disappointed that you did not incorporate critical balancing amendments to the "Street Safety Act," or, more commonly known as Vision Zero 2.0. Please bring these ideas to the table as a separate resolution.

As written the Street Safety Act is not about safety and will not achieve that goal. It is also onerous and oppressive to the majority of San Franciscans.

Proposed RECITALS:

WHEREAS, The streets of San Francisco are used by all San Franciscans for all modes of transportation, including but not limited to, walking, scootering, bicycling, motorcycling, driving, and public transit; and

WHEREAS The use of city streets inevitably involves some unavoidable risk; and

WHEREAS All users of city streets share in the responsibility for their own safety, as well as for conducting themselves in a manner safe for themselves and others; and

WHEREAS Street design involves unavoidable tradeoffs that should balance the efficacy of the

various transportation modes; and

WHEREAS All users of San Francisco streets have a legitimate expectation that their use will be facilitated, including drivers of motor vehicles, and not unreasonably impeded, complicated, or disadvantaged; and

WHEREAS More than half of the pedestrian, bicycle, and personal conveyance deaths on San Francisco streets in the last three years were preventable by the deceased by following existing traffic laws; and

WHEREAS San Francisco's surface street traffic moved at the second slowest average speed in the country in 2024 at 14 mph; and

Proposed RESOLUTIONS:

Be it RESOLVED, That all decisions involving street design shall be made with balanced consideration to the needs of all transportation modes; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That all street redesign projects that are significant, including but not limited to, speed limit reductions, speed hump installations, removal of a traffic lane, removal of parking spaces, and significant reconfiguration of traffic flow, shall require a cost/benefit review and report from an outside firm nationally recognized to be a non-partisan engineering expert in such matters, retained and managed by the San Francisco Controller's office; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED That the SFMTA shall identify the core motor vehicle traffic corridors throughout the city, shall prioritize these corridors for motor vehicle traffic, and shall publish a report by December 2026 outlining prioritized projects to increase traffic throughput on these corridors with the goal of average motor vehicle speeds of no less than 5mph lower than currently posted speeds; this report and project shall be given no less prominence, time, attention, budget, and priority than the Biking and Rolling Plan, the Northstar Network, and Vision Zero (and related programs) plans, reports, and activities.

Sincerely,

From: [richard.brandi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 3:03:34 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent richard.brandi

Email rbrandi@earthlink.net

Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!

Message:

Dear Supervisor,

I'm disappointed that you did not incorporate critical balancing amendments to the "Street Safety Act," or, more commonly known as Vision Zero 2.0. Please bring these ideas to the table as a separate resolution.

As written the Street Safety Act is not about safety and will not achieve that goal. It is also onerous and oppressive to the majority of San Franciscans.

Proposed RECITALS:

WHEREAS, The streets of San Francisco are used by all San Franciscans for all modes of transportation, including but not limited to, walking, scootering, bicycling, motorcycling, driving, and public transit; and

WHEREAS The use of city streets inevitably involves some unavoidable risk; and

WHEREAS All users of city streets share in the responsibility for their own safety, as well as for conducting themselves in a manner safe for themselves and others; and

WHEREAS Street design involves unavoidable tradeoffs that should balance the efficacy of the

various transportation modes; and

WHEREAS All users of San Francisco streets have a legitimate expectation that their use will be facilitated, including drivers of motor vehicles, and not unreasonably impeded, complicated, or disadvantaged; and

WHEREAS More than half of the pedestrian, bicycle, and personal conveyance deaths on San Francisco streets in the last three years were preventable by the deceased by following existing traffic laws; and

WHEREAS San Francisco's surface street traffic moved at the second slowest average speed in the country in 2024 at 14 mph; and

Proposed RESOLUTIONS:

Be it RESOLVED, That all decisions involving street design shall be made with balanced consideration to the needs of all transportation modes; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That all street redesign projects that are significant, including but not limited to, speed limit reductions, speed hump installations, removal of a traffic lane, removal of parking spaces, and significant reconfiguration of traffic flow, shall require a cost/benefit review and report from an outside firm nationally recognized to be a non-partisan engineering expert in such matters, retained and managed by the San Francisco Controller's office; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED That the SFMTA shall identify the core motor vehicle traffic corridors throughout the city, shall prioritize these corridors for motor vehicle traffic, and shall publish a report by December 2026 outlining prioritized projects to increase traffic throughput on these corridors with the goal of average motor vehicle speeds of no less than 5mph lower than currently posted speeds; this report and project shall be given no less prominence, time, attention, budget, and priority than the Biking and Rolling Plan, the Northstar Network, and Vision Zero (and related programs) plans, reports, and activities.

Sincerely,

From: [Jane E. Smalley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 11:08:25 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 and Mayor

From your constituent Jane E Smalley

Email janesmalley1@juno.com

Support a functional city, protect families, keep SF moving!

Message:

Dear Supervisor,

I'm disappointed that you did not incorporate critical balancing amendments to the "Street Safety Act," or, more commonly known as Vision Zero 2.0. Please bring these ideas to the table as a separate resolution.

As written the Street Safety Act is not about safety and will not achieve that goal. It is also onerous and oppressive to the majority of San Franciscans.

Proposed RECITALS:

WHEREAS, The streets of San Francisco are used by all San Franciscans for all modes of transportation, including but not limited to, walking, scootering, bicycling, motorcycling, driving, and public transit; and

WHEREAS The use of city streets inevitably involves some unavoidable risk; and

WHEREAS All users of city streets share in the responsibility for their own safety, as well as for conducting themselves in a manner safe for themselves and others; and

WHEREAS Street design involves unavoidable tradeoffs that should balance the efficacy of the

various transportation modes; and

WHEREAS All users of San Francisco streets have a legitimate expectation that their use will be facilitated, including drivers of motor vehicles, and not unreasonably impeded, complicated, or disadvantaged; and

WHEREAS More than half of the pedestrian, bicycle, and personal conveyance deaths on San Francisco streets in the last three years were preventable by the deceased by following existing traffic laws; and

WHEREAS San Francisco's surface street traffic moved at the second slowest average speed in the country in 2024 at 14 mph; and

Proposed RESOLUTIONS:

Be it RESOLVED, That all decisions involving street design shall be made with balanced consideration to the needs of all transportation modes; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That all street redesign projects that are significant, including but not limited to, speed limit reductions, speed hump installations, removal of a traffic lane, removal of parking spaces, and significant reconfiguration of traffic flow, shall require a cost/benefit review and report from an outside firm nationally recognized to be a non-partisan engineering expert in such matters, retained and managed by the San Francisco Controller's office; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED That the SFMTA shall identify the core motor vehicle traffic corridors throughout the city, shall prioritize these corridors for motor vehicle traffic, and shall publish a report by December 2026 outlining prioritized projects to increase traffic throughput on these corridors with the goal of average motor vehicle speeds of no less than 5mph lower than currently posted speeds; this report and project shall be given no less prominence, time, attention, budget, and priority than the Biking and Rolling Plan, the Northstar Network, and Vision Zero (and related programs) plans, reports, and activities.

Sincerely,

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 \(BOS\)](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools - 23 letters
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 12:58:15 PM
Attachments: [23 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 23 letters, from members of the public regarding:

File No. 250991 - Resolution urging the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) to develop and implement a comprehensive enforcement and intervention plan to address drug use or suspected drug activity especially within 250 feet of parks, playgrounds, and schools, including issuing citations, conducting assessments, and removing individuals for processing or detoxification services.

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: [Calum Mackay](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 6:48:40 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Calum Mackay

Email CalumLMackay@gmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Hatun Noguera](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 7:23:21 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Hatun Noguera

Email noguera@changes.world

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Tiffany Waugh](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 7:24:35 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Tiffany Waugh

Email tiffanyparalta@gmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [John Robert Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 7:28:29 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent John Robert Smith

Email timepuzzle@earthlink.net

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Sarah Anderson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 7:44:36 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Sarah Anderson

Email sandersonsf@gmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Cryztal Sayle](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 8:00:46 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Cryztal Sayle

Email csayle2010@gmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Dennis Tsai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 8:29:33 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Dennis Tsai

Email dtsai6277@aol.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Brad McMillan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 9:00:38 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Brad McMillan

Email mcmillan@viselect.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Peter Rapier](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 9:47:27 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Peter Rapier

Email peter.rapier@gmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Francine Lofrano](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 9:56:17 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Francine Lofrano

Email ftblote@sbcglobal.net

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate the DISGUSTING drug use from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws and CONSEQUENCES!!!!

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution

does not create new laws or criminal justice policies, but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Anthony Villa](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 10:51:27 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Anthony Villa

Email tvobsf@gmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Amy U](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 11:06:36 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Amy U

Email amy.grossi.carr@gmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Helen Spalding](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 3:56:36 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Helen Spalding

Email helenmspalding@gmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [pamela.smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 7:35:39 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent pamela smith
Email pamontherun@yahoo.com
Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Angela Lee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 8:26:29 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Angela Lee

Email angiekye@hotmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Phoebe Schreiber](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 8:47:31 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Phoebe Schreiber

Email phoeberose@gmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Christina Gill](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 8:56:35 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Christina Gill

Email cxmonga@gmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Cecilia Sagrera-Hill](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 9:48:46 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Cecilia Sagrera-Hill

Email cecilia@sagrerabrazildesign.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Gnarity Burke](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 12:26:31 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Gnarity Burke

Email urban42n81@gmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [jim.connelly](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 1:18:46 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent jim connelly

Email jim-connelly@comcast.net

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Assunta Young](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 2:13:23 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Assunta Young

Email assuntayoung46@gmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Marny Homan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Saturday, October 4, 2025 8:37:23 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Marny Homan

Email marny.homan@gmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Jane E. Smalley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 11:00:28 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission,
Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Jane E Smalley

Email janesmalley1@juno.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message: Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Letter of support, 530 Sansome (ahead of 10/7 Board of Supervisors meeting)
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 1:11:00 PM
Attachments: [530 Sansome 9-26-25-1.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from UNITE/HERE, Local 2, regarding File Nos. 250697, 250698, and 250803.

On today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda, File No. 250697 is Item No. 16, File No. 250698 is Item No. 25, and File No. 250803 is Item No. 26.

File No. 250697: Ordinance amending the Planning Code to create the 530 Sansome Mixed-Use Tower and Fire Station Special Use District, including a conditional use review and approval process allowing streamlined approval and exceptions from certain Planning Code requirements and the conditional rescission of an existing Article 10 landmark designation of 447 Battery Street within the Special Use District; revising the Zoning Map to increase the maximum height for Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0206, Lot Nos. 013, 014, and 017 within the Special Use District; adopting findings 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 general welfare under Planning Code, Section 302. (Mayor, Sauter)

File No. 250698: Ordinance approving a Development Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco and EQX Jackson SQ Holdco LLC for the development of a project on certain real property known as 425 Washington Street, 439-445 Washington Street, 530 Sansome Street, and 447 Battery Street, and generally bounded by Sansome Street to the west, Washington Street to the north, Battery Street to the east, and Merchant Street to the south; approving certain impact fees and accepting and appropriating a \$4,310,710 additional affordable housing payment; confirming compliance with or waiving certain provisions of the Administrative Code, Planning Code, Public Works Code, Labor and Employment Code, and Health Code; ratifying past actions and authorizing future actions in furtherance of this Ordinance, as defined herein; adopting findings under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of conformity with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b); and making findings of public necessity, convenience, and general welfare under Planning Code, Section 302. (Mayor, Sauter)

File No. 250803: Ordinance approving a Hotel and Fire Station Development Incentive Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco and EQX Jackson SQ Holdco

LLC for the 530 Sansome Mixed Use Tower and Fire Station 13 Development Project, to provide financial assistance of up to \$86,089,195 in net present value over 25 years calculated for measurement purposes only as a percentage of new Transient Occupancy Taxes the City actually receives from occupancy of guest rooms in a proposed new hotel, related to the development and operation of a project on certain real property known as 425 Washington Street, 439-445 Washington Street, 530 Sansome Street, and 447 Battery Street, and generally bounded by Sansome Street to the west, Washington Street to the north, Battery Street to the east, and Merchant Street to the south; waiving Chapter 21G of the Administrative Code; ratifying past actions and authorizing future actions in furtherance of this Ordinance, as defined herein; and adopting the Board of Supervisors' findings under the California Environmental Quality Act and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1. (Mayor, 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: Cynthia Gómez <cgomez@unitehere2.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 2, 2025 3:00 PM
To: Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@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>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter of support, 530 Sansome (ahead of 10/7 Board of Supervisors meeting)

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

Hello Supervisors,

Please find attached a copy of a letter, sent to the Land Use and GAO committees as well, expressing our support for the project at 530 Sansome, which I understand is on

the agenda for the 10/7 Board of Supervisors meeting. Please feel free to email me with any questions; I am always happy to chat.

Thank you,

--

Cynthia Gómez
Senior Research Analyst
she/her/hers
UNITE/HERE, Local 2
209 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
cgomez@unitehere2.org
[415.864.8770](tel:415.864.8770), ext. 763



UNITE HERE!

September 26, 2025

VIA EMAIL

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen, and Mahmood,

We are pleased to write this letter in support of the proposed project at 530 Sansome Street/447 Washington Street.

As a union representing hospitality employees, we are concerned with whether new jobs created in this industry will serve to lift up the community by providing leading wages and working conditions for the hardworking people who work in our city's hotels.

Hotel developers have historically supported the creation of good quality jobs by agreeing to remain neutral and present no encumbrances to efforts by their employees to form a union. The developer of this project has worked with our union to sign such an agreement, and has also signed an agreement that will cover the building trades for the construction of the hotel.

This project will undertake to provide the city with a new and improved fire station, which we understand is sorely needed and will better meet the needs of the hardworking firefighters who protect our city and its residents.

We support this project for its various benefits, including, most crucially, its guarantees of good quality jobs in this critical industry for San Francisco.

Please feel free to contact me if you have further questions.

Cynthia Gómez
Senior Research Analyst

cgomez@unitehere2.org

opeiu-29-afl-cio(51)mds

Elizabeth Tapia
President

Tina Chen
Secretary-Treasurer

Yulisa Elenes
Vice-President

Chito Cuellar
Vice-President

209 Golden Gate Ave., San Francisco, CA 94102 • phone: 415.864.8770 • fax: 415.864.4158
209 Highland Ave. Burlingame, CA 94010 • phone: 650.344.6827 • fax: 650.344.9406
1025 3rd St., Oakland, CA 94607 • phone: 510.893.3181

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: Sex workers in the Mission District - 7 letters
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 1:13:49 PM
Attachments: [Sex Workers 7 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 7 letters, from members of the public, regarding sex workers in the Mission District.

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: [Calum Mackay](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Perdomo, Sean \(POL\)](#); [Yep, Paul \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Mission Station, \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#)
Subject: Take Action to End Prostitution Ravaging Streets in the Mission
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 6:49:31 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 Calum Mackay

Email CalumLMackay@gmail.com

Subject Take Action to End Prostitution Ravaging Streets in the Mission

Message: Dear Supervisor Fielder,

Mission residents urge you to take decisive action to stop illegal prostitution from degrading the quality of life along Shotwell Street and nearby neighborhoods. So far, the City's half-measures have merely shifted the problem from one street to another. That is not a solution. While you've expressed sympathy for the women being exploited on our streets, your constituents also deserve your sympathy—and your commitment—to end the sex trade in front of our homes, schools, parks and businesses.

Prostitution is not a victimless crime—families are forced to live with constant unsafe traffic, discarded syringes and condoms, and lewd acts in plain sight. It is unconscionable that we have endured years of trauma under supervisors who, through dysfunction or disregard, have failed their constituents. We demand a comprehensive, sustained strategy that uses every available tool and coordination across all relevant agencies to protect Mission residents and businesses from the harm of unchecked sex trafficking on our streets.

Specifically:
Community—law enforcement cooperation: Build stronger partnerships between residents and SFPD to ensure accountability and shared responsibility.

Real accountability: Measure success by concrete outcomes—such as reduced street prostitution and improved neighborhood safety—not by hours logged or nonprofits funded.

Increased enforcement: Strengthen police presence and employ targeted interventions against traffickers and sex buyers.

Expanded investigative tools: Authorize SFPD to use phone-tapping powers already permitted in human trafficking cases and proven effective in other jurisdictions, impounding the cars of johns, and sending 'Dear John' letters to their homes.

Technology partnerships: Collaborate with tech companies to create tools and apps that support law enforcement and victim services.

We ask that you commit to using every law and every tool available—without delay—to restore safety and livability to our community and put an end to illegal sex-trafficking and prostitution in the Mission.

Sincerely,

cc: Mayor Lurie, Interim Chief Yep, Mission Police Captain, DA's office

From: [Hatun Noguera](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Perdomo, Sean \(POL\)](#); [Yep, Paul \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Mission Station, \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#)
Subject: Take Action to End Prostitution Ravaging Streets in the Mission
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 7:24:23 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 Hatun Noguera

Email noguera@changes.world

Subject Take Action to End Prostitution Ravaging Streets in the Mission

Message: Dear Supervisor Fielder,

Mission residents urge you to take decisive action to stop illegal prostitution from degrading the quality of life along Shotwell Street and nearby neighborhoods. So far, the City's half-measures have merely shifted the problem from one street to another. That is not a solution. While you've expressed sympathy for the women being exploited on our streets, your constituents also deserve your sympathy—and your commitment—to end the sex trade in front of our homes, schools, parks and businesses.

Prostitution is not a victimless crime—families are forced to live with constant unsafe traffic, discarded syringes and condoms, and lewd acts in plain sight. It is unconscionable that we have endured years of trauma under supervisors who, through dysfunction or disregard, have failed their constituents. We demand a comprehensive, sustained strategy that uses every available tool and coordination across all relevant agencies to protect Mission residents and businesses from the harm of unchecked sex trafficking on our streets.

Specifically:
Community—law enforcement cooperation: Build stronger partnerships between residents and SFPD to ensure accountability and shared responsibility.

Real accountability: Measure success by concrete outcomes—such as reduced street prostitution and improved neighborhood safety—not by hours logged or nonprofits funded.

Increased enforcement: Strengthen police presence and employ targeted interventions against traffickers and sex buyers.

Expanded investigative tools: Authorize SFPD to use phone-tapping powers already permitted in human trafficking cases and proven effective in other jurisdictions, impounding the cars of johns, and sending 'Dear John' letters to their homes.

Technology partnerships: Collaborate with tech companies to create tools and apps that support law enforcement and victim services.

We ask that you commit to using every law and every tool available—without delay—to restore safety and livability to our community and put an end to illegal sex-trafficking and prostitution in the Mission.

Sincerely,

cc: Mayor Lurie, Interim Chief Yep, Mission Police Captain, DA's office

From: [John Robert Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Perdomo, Sean \(POL\)](#); [Yep, Paul \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Mission Station, \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#)
Subject: Take Action to End Prostitution Ravaging Streets in the Mission
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 7:29:34 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	John Robert Smith
Email	timepuzzle@earthlink.net
Subject	Take Action to End Prostitution Ravaging Streets in the Mission
Message:	Dear Supervisor Fielder,

Mission residents urge you to take decisive action to stop illegal prostitution from degrading the quality of life along Shotwell Street and nearby neighborhoods. So far, the City's half-measures have merely shifted the problem from one street to another. That is not a solution. While you've expressed sympathy for the women being exploited on our streets, your constituents also deserve your sympathy—and your commitment—to end the sex trade in front of our homes, schools, parks and businesses.

Prostitution is not a victimless crime—families are forced to live with constant unsafe traffic, discarded syringes and condoms, and lewd acts in plain sight. It is unconscionable that we have endured years of trauma under supervisors who, through dysfunction or disregard, have failed their constituents. We demand a comprehensive, sustained strategy that uses every available tool and coordination across all relevant agencies to protect Mission residents and businesses from the harm of unchecked sex trafficking on our streets.

Specifically:
Community—law enforcement cooperation: Build stronger partnerships between residents and SFPD to ensure accountability and shared responsibility.

Real accountability: Measure success by concrete outcomes—such as reduced street prostitution and improved neighborhood safety—not by hours logged or nonprofits funded.

Increased enforcement: Strengthen police presence and employ targeted interventions against traffickers and sex buyers.

Expanded investigative tools: Authorize SFPD to use phone-tapping powers already permitted in human trafficking cases and proven effective in other jurisdictions, impounding the cars of johns, and sending 'Dear John' letters to their homes.

Technology partnerships: Collaborate with tech companies to create tools and apps that support law enforcement and victim services.

We ask that you commit to using every law and every tool available—without delay—to restore safety and livability to our community and put an end to illegal sex-trafficking and prostitution in the Mission.

Sincerely,

cc: Mayor Lurie, Interim Chief Yep, Mission Police Captain, DA's office

From: [Dennis Tsai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Perdomo, Sean \(POL\)](#); [Yep, Paul \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Mission Station, \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#)
Subject: Take Action to End Prostitution Ravaging Streets in the Mission
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 8:52:37 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 Dennis Tsai

Email dtsai6277@aol.com

Subject Take Action to End Prostitution Ravaging Streets in the Mission

Message: Dear Supervisor Fielder,

Mission residents urge you to take decisive action to stop illegal prostitution from degrading the quality of life along Shotwell Street and nearby neighborhoods. So far, the City's half-measures have merely shifted the problem from one street to another. That is not a solution. While you've expressed sympathy for the women being exploited on our streets, your constituents also deserve your sympathy—and your commitment—to end the sex trade in front of our homes, schools, parks and businesses.

Prostitution is not a victimless crime—families are forced to live with constant unsafe traffic, discarded syringes and condoms, and lewd acts in plain sight. It is unconscionable that we have endured years of trauma under supervisors who, through dysfunction or disregard, have failed their constituents. We demand a comprehensive, sustained strategy that uses every available tool and coordination across all relevant agencies to protect Mission residents and businesses from the harm of unchecked sex trafficking on our streets.

Specifically:
Community—law enforcement cooperation: Build stronger partnerships between residents and SFPD to ensure accountability and shared responsibility.

Real accountability: Measure success by concrete outcomes—such as reduced street prostitution and improved neighborhood safety—not by hours logged or nonprofits funded.

Increased enforcement: Strengthen police presence and employ targeted interventions against traffickers and sex buyers.

Expanded investigative tools: Authorize SFPD to use phone-tapping powers already permitted in human trafficking cases and proven effective in other jurisdictions, impounding the cars of johns, and sending 'Dear John' letters to their homes.

Technology partnerships: Collaborate with tech companies to create tools and apps that support law enforcement and victim services.

We ask that you commit to using every law and every tool available—without delay—to restore safety and livability to our community and put an end to illegal sex-trafficking and prostitution in the Mission.

Though I do not reside in the Mission district, I can empathize with our neighborhood residences who have to put up with these illegal activities that a normal police department would prevent as part of its duty and responsibility. However, due in part to staff shortage caused by our previous mayor who defunded ~\$200 million from the Police Department for questionable uses (which turned out to be managed by a corrupt manager who mismanaged/embezzled funds for her personal use) its understandable. But now that we have an effective and honest mayor, it is now important for the Police Department to finally perform its duty to keep SF a safe and lawful city.

Sincerely,

Dennis Tsai

cc: Mayor Lurie, Interim Chief Yep, Mission Police Captain, DA's office

From: [Anthony Villa](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Perdomo, Sean \(POL\)](#); [Yep, Paul \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Mission Station, \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#)
Subject: Take Action to End Prostitution Ravaging Streets in the Mission
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 10:54:30 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 Anthony Villa

Email tvobsf@gmail.com

Subject Take Action to End Prostitution Ravaging Streets in the Mission

Message: Dear Supervisor Fielder,

Mission residents urge you to take decisive action to stop illegal prostitution from degrading the quality of life along Shotwell Street and nearby neighborhoods. So far, the City's half-measures have merely shifted the problem from one street to another. That is not a solution. While you've expressed sympathy for the women being exploited on our streets, your constituents also deserve your sympathy—and your commitment—to end the sex trade in front of our homes, schools, parks and businesses.

Prostitution is not a victimless crime—families are forced to live with constant unsafe traffic, discarded syringes and condoms, and lewd acts in plain sight. It is unconscionable that we have endured years of trauma under supervisors who, through dysfunction or disregard, have failed their constituents. We demand a comprehensive, sustained strategy that uses every available tool and coordination across all relevant agencies to protect Mission residents and businesses from the harm of unchecked sex trafficking on our streets.

Specifically:
Community—law enforcement cooperation: Build stronger partnerships between residents and SFPD to ensure accountability and shared responsibility.

Real accountability: Measure success by concrete outcomes—such as reduced street prostitution and improved neighborhood safety—not by hours logged or nonprofits funded.

Increased enforcement: Strengthen police presence and employ targeted interventions against traffickers and sex buyers.

Expanded investigative tools: Authorize SFPD to use phone-tapping powers already permitted in human trafficking cases and proven effective in other jurisdictions, impounding the cars of johns, and sending 'Dear John' letters to their homes.

Technology partnerships: Collaborate with tech companies to create tools and apps that support law enforcement and victim services.

We ask that you commit to using every law and every tool available—without delay—to restore safety and livability to our community and put an end to illegal sex-trafficking and prostitution in the Mission.

Sincerely,

cc: Mayor Lurie, Interim Chief Yep, Mission Police Captain, DA's office

From: [pamela.smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Perdomo, Sean \(POL\)](#); [Yep, Paul \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Mission Station, \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#)
Subject: Take Action to End Prostitution Ravaging Streets in the Mission
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 7:36:32 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 pamela smith

Email pamontherun@yahoo.com

Subject Take Action to End Prostitution Ravaging Streets in the Mission

Message: Dear Supervisor Fielder,

Mission residents urge you to take decisive action to stop illegal prostitution from degrading the quality of life along Shotwell Street and nearby neighborhoods. So far, the City's half-measures have merely shifted the problem from one street to another. That is not a solution. While you've expressed sympathy for the women being exploited on our streets, your constituents also deserve your sympathy—and your commitment—to end the sex trade in front of our homes, schools, parks and businesses.

Prostitution is not a victimless crime—families are forced to live with constant unsafe traffic, discarded syringes and condoms, and lewd acts in plain sight. It is unconscionable that we have endured years of trauma under supervisors who, through dysfunction or disregard, have failed their constituents. We demand a comprehensive, sustained strategy that uses every available tool and coordination across all relevant agencies to protect Mission residents and businesses from the harm of unchecked sex trafficking on our streets.

Specifically:
Community—law enforcement cooperation: Build stronger partnerships between residents and SFPD to ensure accountability and shared responsibility.

Real accountability: Measure success by concrete outcomes—such as reduced street prostitution and improved neighborhood safety—not by hours logged or nonprofits funded.

Increased enforcement: Strengthen police presence and employ targeted interventions against traffickers and sex buyers.

Expanded investigative tools: Authorize SFPD to use phone-tapping powers already permitted in human trafficking cases and proven effective in other jurisdictions, impounding the cars of johns, and sending 'Dear John' letters to their homes.

Technology partnerships: Collaborate with tech companies to create tools and apps that support law enforcement and victim services.

We ask that you commit to using every law and every tool available—without delay—to restore safety and livability to our community and put an end to illegal sex-trafficking and prostitution in the Mission.

Sincerely,

cc: Mayor Lurie, Interim Chief Yep, Mission Police Captain, DA's office

From: [Jane E. Smalley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Perdomo, Sean \(POL\)](#); [Yep, Paul \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Mission Station, \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#)
Subject: Take Action to End Prostitution Ravaging Streets in the Mission
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 11:01:39 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 Jane E Smalley

Email janesmalley1@juno.com

Subject Take Action to End Prostitution Ravaging Streets in the Mission

Message: Dear Supervisor Fielder,

Mission residents urge you to take decisive action to stop illegal prostitution from degrading the quality of life along Shotwell Street and nearby neighborhoods. So far, the City's half-measures have merely shifted the problem from one street to another. That is not a solution. While you've expressed sympathy for the women being exploited on our streets, your constituents also deserve your sympathy—and your commitment—to end the sex trade in front of our homes, schools, parks and businesses.

Prostitution is not a victimless crime—families are forced to live with constant unsafe traffic, discarded syringes and condoms, and lewd acts in plain sight. It is unconscionable that we have endured years of trauma under supervisors who, through dysfunction or disregard, have failed their constituents. We demand a comprehensive, sustained strategy that uses every available tool and coordination across all relevant agencies to protect Mission residents and businesses from the harm of unchecked sex trafficking on our streets.

Specifically:
Community—law enforcement cooperation: Build stronger partnerships between residents and SFPD to ensure accountability and shared responsibility.

Real accountability: Measure success by concrete outcomes—such as reduced street prostitution and improved neighborhood safety—not by hours logged or nonprofits funded.

Increased enforcement: Strengthen police presence and employ targeted interventions against traffickers and sex buyers.

Expanded investigative tools: Authorize SFPD to use phone-tapping powers already permitted in human trafficking cases and proven effective in other jurisdictions, impounding the cars of johns, and sending 'Dear John' letters to their homes.

Technology partnerships: Collaborate with tech companies to create tools and apps that support law enforcement and victim services.

We ask that you commit to using every law and every tool available—without delay—to restore safety and livability to our community and put an end to illegal sex-trafficking and prostitution in the Mission.

Sincerely,

cc: Mayor Lurie, Interim Chief Yep, Mission Police Captain, DA's office

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 Dr. 2 letters
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 1:17:21 PM
Attachments: [JFK Dr 2 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 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: [Eileen Landini](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: JFK Drive
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 9:26:35 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

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,
Eileen Landini

From: [Fred Levinson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: JFK
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 1:23:04 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,
Fred Levinson
55 Raycliff Terrace
San Francisco, CA 94115

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: Residential Parking Meters - 36 letters
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 1:21:52 PM
Attachments: [Residential Meters 36 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 36 letters, from members of the public, regarding the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) efforts to install parking meters on residential 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: [Helen McClure](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 6:51:38 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 Helen McClure

Email helen@castrocbd.org

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message: Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Hatun Noguera](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 7:23:32 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 Hatun Noguera

Email noguera@changes.world

I live in

Phone Number (Not required) (628) 333-4600

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this

threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [mary walsh gorski](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 7:23:33 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 mary walsh gorski

Email mcwgorski@gmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [John Robert Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 7:29:25 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 John Robert Smith

Email timepuzzle@earthlink.net

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [John Lozynsky](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 7:32:23 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 John Lozynsky

Email johnlozy@yahoo.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Mark Felix](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 7:32:32 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 Mark Felix

Email mafelix86@yahoo.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [James McFadden](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 7:43:38 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 James McFadden

Email jimmcfsf@gmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Dennis Richards](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 8:08:25 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 Dennis Richards

Email drichards20@outlook.com

I live in

Phone Number (Not required) (415) 350-9269

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this

threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Dennis Tsai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 8:36:30 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 Dennis Tsai

Email dtsai6277@aol.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message: Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Furthermore, I would say that SFMTA's only wish is to find funds to accommodate its incompetence in managing the transit system effectively, and not to improve the public transit experience.

Thank you,

From: [Jamie O'Keefe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 8:49:43 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 Jamie O'Keefe

Email jokeefe415@gmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,
Jamie O'Keefe

From: [Lisa Harpenau](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 9:06:32 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 Lisa Harpenau
Email airy-freest.0n@icloud.com
I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message: Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Eugene Galvin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 9:22:33 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 Eugene Galvin

Email eggalvin@hotmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Peter Rapier](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 9:46:31 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 Peter Rapier

Email peter.rapier@gmail.com

I live in

Phone Number (Not required) (415) 350-8372

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

Muni needs to clean up it's act. Pay for itself.

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe,

and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Anthony Villa](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 10:53:27 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 Anthony Villa

Email tvobsf@gmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Tina Han](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 11:17:33 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 City Attorney

From your constituent Tina Han

Email hantina23@gmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Alissa Anderson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 7:42:27 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 Alissa Anderson

Email alissa@foggy-notion.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

I'm a small business owner on Clement Street and I vehemently OPPOSE an increase of paid parking in SF! Business owners have it hard enough - we need MORE visitors to our shops and restaurants, not less. We also need to maintain parking for residents' visitors and service workers. There is already too much 2 hour residential parking and parking meters in the Inner Richmond.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets right in front of shops where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive.

Thank you,

From: [Cheryl Karpowicz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 8:09:45 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 City Attorney

From your constituent Cheryl Karpowicz

Email Cherylkarpowicz@gmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message: Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

I am opposed to paid parking in residential districts. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Adrienne Hoyer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 8:42:45 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 City Attorney

From your constituent Adrienne Hoyer

Email amhoyer@sbcglobal.net

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Alex Stumpf](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 9:28:46 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 Alex Stumpf

Email ajjstumpf@gmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message: Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Clothilde Kennedy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 10:02:54 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 Clothilde Kennedy

Email clo8183@sbcglobal.net

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message: Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Mike Ednoff](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 11:48:22 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 City Attorney

From your constituent Mike Ednoff

Email ednoff@msn.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Denise Selleck](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 12:10:39 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Denise Selleck

Email deniselleck@sbcglobal.net

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message: Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Gnarity Burke](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 12:29:33 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

I live in

Phone Number (Not required) (415) 487-3528

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

Contested in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not appear to want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this

threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Anne Marie Massocca](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 12:55:43 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 Anne Marie Massocca
Email amassocc@sbcglobal.net
I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Assunta Young](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 2:14:31 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 Assunta Young

Email assuntayoung46@gmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message: Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Catherine McGarvey](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 5:14:33 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 Catherine McGarvey

Email clivy@sbcglobal.net

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Cynthia Brown](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Saturday, October 4, 2025 9:04:26 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 Cynthia Brown

Email cymphany@hotmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Joyce Chan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Saturday, October 4, 2025 9:24:28 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 Joyce Chan

Email jmch888@aol.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message: Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [LaVive Kiely](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Saturday, October 4, 2025 12:46:20 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 LaVive Kiely

Email kielykids@gmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message: Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Katherine Alba](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Monday, October 6, 2025 8:35:38 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 Katherine Alba

Email alba43sf@gmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Anne Hoyer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Monday, October 6, 2025 9:42:13 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 Anne Hoyer

Email amhoyer2@gmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message: Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Sharon Handa](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Monday, October 6, 2025 11:01:31 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 City Attorney

From your constituent Sharon Handa

Email shandaf7@yahoo.com

I live in

Phone Number (Not required) (415) 665-7522

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this

threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Melissa Aurand](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Monday, October 6, 2025 11:56:39 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 Melissa Aurand

Email melissa.w.aurand@gmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

Melissa Aurand

PS The MTA has more power than it should over San Francisco residents. It should be focused on mass transit (bus and light rail) ONLY. Parking, speed bumps, bikes etc need to be placed elsewhere.

From: [Marna Armstead](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 3:28:28 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 Marna Armstead

Email marnaarmstead@gmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message: Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Senta Tsantilis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 5:43:51 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 City Attorney

From your constituent Senta Tsantilis

Email sptsantilis@gmail.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Jane E. Smalley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 11:00:55 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 Jane E Smalley

Email janesmalley1@juno.com

I live in

Enough is enough! No SFMTA paid parking on residential streets in SF.

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA,

This has been fought in multiple districts, San Franciscans do not want paid parking on residential streets. This program is simply hostile to residents. Our government should work FOR us, not against us.

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's proposal to end free 2 hour parking on many residential streets. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) in residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming. Ahh - what a wonderful word: welcoming.

****I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets around commercial corridors anywhere in San Francisco. ****

SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San

Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA's track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. SF should be livable and welcoming, not hostile.

Parking meters belong only on commercial streets where turnover matters, not in residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

SFMTA is destroying businesses and quality of life. It's time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [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: Great Highway/Sunset Dunes - 39 letters
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 1:28:59 PM
Attachments: [39 letters.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached for 39 letters, from members of the public, regarding Great Highway/Sunset Dunes.

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: [Gregor, Eugene C.](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sunset dunes a west side success like jfk --message from a senior Asian American car driving d1 resident who supports sunset dunes park
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 3:31:57 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

ECG

From: [C.C](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for Sunset Dunes
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 3:36:51 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been great for Outer Sunset and Outer Richmond businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined.

I live in the Outer Richmond and love Sunset Dunes. The voters approved closing the Great Highway, so please do not betray our wishes and our votes!

Carolyn Cooper

From: [Craig Jones](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 3:47:43 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

Craig Jones and our family (residents of SF since 2015)

From: [Alex](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 3:52:29 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors, Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before. As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses Why? Because:- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow. - Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal. San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added. Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come. Thank you for your leadership.

Alex Robinson

From: [Lisa Ericson](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 4:10:25 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for your leadership.

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset *businesses*, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of **Sunset Dunes** to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that **Sunset Dunes** has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. **Sunset Dunes** has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed

to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make **Sunset Dunes** a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of **Sunset Dunes**, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

From: [Heidi Hansen](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 4:24:40 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

Kind regards,
Heidi Hansen and Richard Watkins
145 Laurel St
San Francisco 94118

From: [Edda Mai Johnson](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 4:36:15 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

However Please Discourage Dirt Bikes and Motorcycle on Dunes Walkways- Very Unsafe!

Thank you for your leadership.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Stuart Oppenheim](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 4:37:08 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

From: [Christine Valentine](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 5:37:01 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

Sent from my iPad

From: [Audrey Castillo](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 7:17:10 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Do what's right for the environment.

From: [Elisabeth Askin](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 8:02:58 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As someone who lives on a street impacted by the closure (19th avenue), who previously used Great Highway to commute between work sites (the VA clinics), and who frequently uses Great Highway/Sunset Dunes for exercise with my kids, I feel I have a strong take on this matter. Taking Sunset or 19th Ave instead of Great Highway takes like 3 extra minutes (and will be the same once the feeder from Skyline closes, which is the strongest reason to maintain the closure). I cannot emphasize enough that the increase in traffic is negligible, ESPECIALLY on Lower Great Highway, which still sees a very modest amount of traffic Sunset Dunes is now a lovely community site, heavily used, with great events for families. Do people want to re-open the highway along the Embarcadero? Pave over Golden Gate Park and make it a parking lot? The behavior and reaction by the "Recall Joel Engardio" groups has been absurd and insane. I believe the reaction is primarily based in people who want to preserve car culture and react negatively to anything that reduces car primacy, *not* based in the actual reality of this street/park. Please take the long view and maintain this park -- just imagine if the Mayor has rebuilt the Emcardero Freeway!!!

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a

weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

Elisabeth Askin

From: [AJ](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Protect Sunset Dunes; the Great Highway is crumbling into the sea anyway.
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 11:32:23 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

Sincerely,

AJ cho

Sent via [Wildhero](#) - email that plants trees.

From: [Robert Francoeur](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 6:28:17 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

Robert Francoeur, MS, LMFT, PPSC

From: [ttl Par](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 6:38:56 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

From: [Catriona Miller](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 8:35:16 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you,
Catriona Miller

From: [Samantha N](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 8:44:05 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.
Samantha Nadeau
Long time SF resident

From: [Marc Haumann](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 9:22:17 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before. As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks, and go champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses.

Thanks,
Marc Haumann

From: [Arwen Anderson](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 9:31:49 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes (or enjoying a safe space in which to do their first solo ride!) wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

Arwen Anderson

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Sayuri Falconer](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 11:47:06 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

Sayuri Falconer
District 1
38 Tacoma 94118

From: [Michael Keshish](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 11:55:27 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

From: [Jonathan Mitchell](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sunset Dunes love
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 1:19:08 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscan's to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscan's have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscan's did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscan's voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscan's and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

From: [Cory Basten](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 1:46:32 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

Best regards,
Cory

From: [Joseph Kleinhenz](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Saturday, October 4, 2025 9:53:16 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my strong support for Sunset Dunes park and the full closure of the great highway. My wife and I have lived in the outer sunset since 2020 and we have both found the park to be an amazing addition to the neighborhood. The improvements to the park since the great highway was fully closed have also been great to see. I am regularly making use of the exercise equipment and the sculptures, art and pianos all make it a lovely space. We are expecting our first child in the next month and I have been very much looking forward to taking the baby to the park in the stroller. We are down at the park several times every week and I am frequently struck by the way that the park makes the ocean accessible to all kinds of San Franciscans from seniors to children who are able to easily enjoy the view without the noise, danger and pollution from car traffic.

I would be very disappointed to see any return of cars to the great highway.
I commute to work on Sunset every day and traffic is not an issue.
SF already voted to approve the park and I believe it would be a huge mistake to reverse this.

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

From: [Clarissa Kearns](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support reopening the Great Highway on weekdays
Date: Saturday, October 4, 2025 2:08:32 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Prop K was overwhelmingly disapproved by those affected by it most: those who live in the Sunset and Richmond Districts. I am one of them. I live and send my three kids to public schools in the Outer Richmond.

Had those who live outside of San Francisco, but commute to jobs in San Francisco (such as the principal of my kids' public middle school who drives from San Mateo County), been able to vote, collectively our voices would likely have been much stronger.

To all other SF residents, and by this I mean anyone not living in the Sunset and Richmond Districts, Prop K's proponents' message of replacing a "road to nowhere" with a "park," understandably sounded like a good idea. Who doesn't like the idea of a park? It sounded like a good idea because closing the Great Highway, a road unappreciated by someone living in the Marina, for example, did not affect the majority of San Franciscans on a day-to-day basis. It sounded like a good idea to those who get as far as Ocean Beach only on rare warm days. It sounded like a good idea to those unfamiliar with the area and how it might negatively impact those living in the area.

As one of the San Francisco voters who voted against the permanent closure of the Great Highway, I urge you to:

- Appoint a Sunset District 4 Supervisor who listens to his/her/their constituents;
- Find out from those living in or around Lincoln Way, Sunset Blvd., Chain of Lakes, the Lower Great Highway, and on side/residential streets in the Sunset, how funneling traffic into their neighborhoods has affected them and their families on a daily basis;
- Question whether funneling traffic onto Lincoln Way, a major east-west thoroughfare with many marked but unsignalized crosswalks is safer now for pedestrians accessing GG Park; and the same goes for Chain of Lakes and the Lower Great Highway;
- Analyze whether, particularly in light of a recent critical review of the City's Vision Zero campaign, funneling traffic away from high pedestrian use and high conflict zones, such as Fulton and Lincoln, in favor of the Great Highway is a common sense approach to increasing pedestrian safety;
- Analyze data regarding where people live in relation to where they work in San Francisco;
- Consider that if there is a desire to engineer the portion of the Great Highway that extends south of Sloat (and that runs adjacent to SF's Waste Water Treatment Facility) in order to keep it open, that it can be done. Engineers are capable. Where there's a will, there's a way;
- Recognize that we can do little to control the sand and the winds that blow the sand onto the Great Highway. The sand will be an issue whether there's a "park" on the Great Highway or whether it's a road to many and viable destinations;
- Consider whether the Great Highway serves as an alternative vehicular route for many in the event of a natural disaster or other emergency, and what might happen if all of San Francisco were funneled instead to the Bay and GG Bridges.

Why? Because:

- We already have a coastal park. It's called Ocean Beach.
- We already have carless streets in GG Park and slow streets throughout the City.
- San Francisco's parks are used by most people on the weekends when they are not at work and when their kids are not at school.

- Before Prop K, a compromise had been reached that worked for those who used the Great Highway during the workweek, and those who enjoyed using the Great Highway's lanes as a biking and walking trail on Saturdays and Sundays.
- This compromise kept commuters off residential and high conflict streets, and allowed people to use the Great Highway as a trail on weekends when they were not at work and when their kids were not at school.

I've observed that the skatepark at the end, near Sloat, is extremely popular. It's also temporary in terms of its construction and too small to accommodate safely its high demand. It is also open to the adjacent path of walkers and bikers. I've seen skateboards fly out in front of people passing by.

So, what does this mean? It means we need to invest more in skateparks. I'm all for it. But let's do so thoughtfully. Perhaps research other locations on the west side that more safely accommodate what is clearly a very popular activity. Inside GG Park, near the southern most windmill, perhaps? Or, elsewhere in GG Park where cars are already prohibited? Or, what about the southern end of the parking lot located across from the Beach Chalet? There are likely better and safer places to install a permanent draw for so many of San Francisco's kids, including mine. (And adults; apparently skateboarding is a lifelong thing.)

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of different perspectives.

Clarissa Kearns
Resident, Outer Richmond District
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jamie Yin](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Saturday, October 4, 2025 5:25:30 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

Jamie

From: [Samantha Ramsey](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Really Love Sunset Dunes and Regularly Visit This Park
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 1:21:47 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

I cannot believe we are still litigating this park. The people of San Francisco voted for it. I voted for it, and I regularly visit the park. This is a perfect encapsulation of why this city has untenable housing prices and an out of control homelessness problem. We finally make progress in a positive direction and a handful of residents who didn't get their way can totally reverse what the majority of the city wants. This is exactly why reasonable younger people are leaving for other cities and states.

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

From: [Christopher Kucera](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 1:28:00 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

From: [Frank DeGuire](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 2:58:19 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

From: [Dustin Palmer](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 8:18:49 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

From: [Mirella G Niskala](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Monday, October 6, 2025 10:26:33 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.
G. Mirella Niskala

From: [Aaron Baucom](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Monday, October 6, 2025 12:31:02 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

- Aaron Baucom

From: [Karolina Östegård Branley](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Monday, October 6, 2025 5:43:47 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

Karolina Branley
Outer Sunset resident

From: [Claudia](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 7:37:17 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [C. Burke](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 9:44:12 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

From: [Joanna Gubman](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes (really!)
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 12:18:54 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

I just turned 41, and for my birthday my family went to Sunset Dunes with another family. We were there from about 5:30-7:00pm on a Tuesday, and the park was full of people enjoying their public space. As I entered, I made way for an elderly woman using a walker to exit. My daughter is almost four, and she and her two friends loved bicycling the whole length of the park & climbing on the octopus. Several teenagers alternated between skateboarding and just hanging out in the skate park. My family and our friend-family are both mixed race. We ran into our friends' friends from their Mandarin-immersion preschool just around the corner from the park. I saw many people of many races and shapes and sizes and ages, speaking many languages. It was a beautiful day and a beautiful sunset. I blew out my birthday candles on the mini-tart I'd bought at Tartine on my way over. Then we all went to Hook Fish for dinner, supporting one of our favorite local businesses.

Please support the park. In this time of national division, we need beautiful and inviting public spaces where we can come together as people to enjoy one another and nature.

Best,
Joanna

Joanna Gubman | Mx./she/her | +1 650 387 7848
www.joannagubman.com | www.linkedin.com/in/joannagubman/

[I've had an abortion](#), and I support bodily autonomy. Feel free to ask me about it!

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:
- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks

- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

From: [Maribethwillcox](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I really, truly love Sunset Dunes
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 7:10:26 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

I live on 36th Avenue, where traffic is increased because of the closure of Great Highway—and let me be clear: I love Sunset Dunes. I feel so very lucky to live in a place that has made space for nature and for humans to enjoy nature. In a time where so many things are pushed online, I'm so proud that we've carved this space for nature restoration and for embodied experiences for people of all ages and abilities.

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

From: [Julia Ravella](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Sunset Dunes needs to stay
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 8:05:55 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses
- Support democracy and what the people already decided

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

In community,
Julia

From: [Margaret Lawrence](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 8:10:02 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

From: [Godwin Chu](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 3:41:02 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.
- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.
- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

Godwin Chu (He/They)

Word Mechanic = Writing : Copyediting : Copywriting

[linkedin.com/in/godwinchu](https://www.linkedin.com/in/godwinchu)

chu.godwin@gmail.com

646-361-3209

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: Vaillancourt Fountain 2 letters
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 1:35:09 PM
Attachments: [2 letters Vaillancourt Fountain.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 letters, from members of the public and various organizations, regarding the Vaillancourt Fountain in Embarcadero Plaza (formerly Justin Herman Plaza).

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: [Admin Docomomo US/NOCA](#)
To: [SauterStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Ginsburg, Phil \(REC\)](#); [Madland, Sarah \(REC\)](#); [Commission, Recpark \(REC\)](#); [Collins, Charles \(ART\)](#); [ART-Info](#); [Matsuda, Diane \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Aaron Fenton](#); [Robbie Silver](#); [info@downtownsf.org](#)
Cc: [emb-vaillancourt-fountain-coalition@googlegroups.com](#)
Subject: Letter: Retain and Rehabilitate Embarcadero Plaza + Vaillancourt Fountain [Oct 3]
Date: Friday, October 3, 2025 8:44:10 AM
Attachments: [20251003 Embarcadero Plaza + Vaillancourt Fountain - October Coalition Letter.pdf](#)

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

To Whom It May Concern,

While some of our groups have discussed this project with you individually, we are writing to further demonstrate the broad consensus of local, national, and international groups around a singular core principle: **Embarcadero Plaza and the Vaillancourt Fountain must be retained and rehabilitated for present and future residents and visitors.**

Our reissued letter is attached, containing additional signatories. In the interest of transparency, we are sharing this letter both [publicly](#) and with members of the media, as well as CCing our coalition.

Please include this letter in the following public policy body meetings and public records, either for the date specified or the soonest scheduled. Individual confirmation from each policy body that the attached letter will be included would be greatly appreciated. When including this letter, **cite all signatories as the sender (listed below).**

- Arts Commission - Full Commission Meeting - October 6, 2025
- Board of Supervisors Meeting - October 7, 2025
- Arts Commission - Visual Arts Committee Meeting - October 15, 2025
- Historic Preservation Commission Meeting - October 15, 2025
-

Recreation and Park Commission Meeting - October 16, 2025

Respectfully,

Bob Pullum, Board Member, [Docomomo US/NOCA](#),

On behalf of our esteemed organizational and individual partners, including:

- [Armand Vaillancourt](#) and the Vaillancourt family
- The [Halprin](#) family
- [California Garden & Landscape History Society \(CGLHS\)](#)
- [California Preservation Foundation \(CPF\)](#)
- [Docomomo US](#)
- [Docomomo US/Northern California](#)
- [ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage \(ISC 20C\)](#)
- [Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal \(MAC\)](#)
- [Musée des beaux-arts du Canada \(National Gallery of Canada\)](#)
- [San Francisco Heritage \(SF Heritage\)](#)
- [San Francisco Historical Society \(SFHS\)](#)
- [Society of Architectural Historians \(SAH\)](#)
- [The Cultural Landscape Foundation \(TCLF\)](#)

do.co.mo.mo_us_noca

Reissued: October 3, 2025
Original: September 19, 2025
San Francisco, California, U.S.

Board of Supervisors
City & County of San Francisco
% Danny Sauter, Supervisor District 3
SauterStaff@sfgov.org, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Office of the Mayor
City & County of San Francisco
% Daniel Lurie, Mayor
daniel.lurie@sfgov.org

Recreation and Park Department
City & County of San Francisco
% Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager
% Sarah Madland, Director of Policy and Public Affairs
phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org, sarah.madland@sfgov.org, recpark.commission@sfgov.org

Arts Commission
City & County of San Francisco
% Chuck Collins, President
charles.collins1@sfgov.org, art-info@sfgov.org

Historic Preservation Commission
City & County of San Francisco
% Diane Matsuda, President
diane.matsuda@sfgov.org, commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

BXP, Inc. (Boston Properties Limited Partnership)
% Aaron Fenton, Senior Vice-President
afenton@bxp.com

Downtown San Francisco Partnership
% Robbie Silver, President & CEO
rsilver@downtownsf.org, info@downtownsf.org

Re: Embarcadero Plaza and Sue Bierman Park Renovation Project

Une version française commence sur la page 8.

To Whom It May Concern,

While some of our groups have discussed this project with you individually, we are writing to demonstrate the broad consensus of local, national, and international groups around a singular core principle: **Embarcadero Plaza and the Vaillancourt Fountain must be retained and rehabilitated for present and future residents and visitors.**

Embarcadero Plaza and Vaillancourt Fountain were conceived as San Francisco's downtown was being transformed into a Modern, post-World War II city. This project was made possible by a confluence of post-war prosperity, federal funding for urban renewal, and the conviction among city leaders that high-quality art and public spaces could be accessible to everyone. World-renowned landscape architect Lawrence Halprin designed the Plaza, and noted Québécois sculptor Armand Vaillancourt's design for the Fountain was selected through a high-profile international design competition that pre-dated and inspired our modern percent-for-art programs.

As with nearly all Halprin landscapes, the integration of movement was created with water, and the Vaillancourt Fountain was selected for its powerful artistic vision and its core belief in the importance of public participation, interaction, and discovery. Halprin's initial inspiration for Embarcadero Plaza was the Spanish plazas and Italian piazzas that have stood for hundreds of years, serving as town squares, gathering spaces, dining areas, celebratory forums, and places of assembly for free expression.

Is that not the stated objective of this renovation?

To fully redevelop this plaza would be to announce to the world that San Francisco has yet to learn how to build and maintain world-class public spaces, something that was achieved by ancient civilizations, yet remains elusive for this modern city.

We—including the artist himself—reject the repeated misrepresentations and negligent treatment of the Vaillancourt Fountain. The artwork, which represents a small but mighty ~2.5% of the total area of Embarcadero Plaza and Sue Bierman Park, was not conceived as a single-purpose object to contrast a freeway. It was created as a freestanding, abstract sculpture intended for interpretation, interaction, and emotional response. As with all significant art, it continues to evolve and adapt, as both it and its audience change. The Fountain has been controversial since its inception—a quality that is a *feature, not a flaw*. It has always been intended to be a point of dialogue and engagement, to say otherwise is to ignore its history and the artist's intent.

The Fountain, originally titled “*Québec Libre!*”, is the artist's only public U.S. artwork. Not only is it San Francisco's most recognizable public art, it is quite literally one-of-a-kind. Furthermore, as its original name suggests, it explores ideas of political and personal freedom, and was created at a time when the artist offered his studio as a safe haven for Native American demonstrators associated with the occupation of Alcatraz Island (1969-1971). Vaillancourt's art is deeply representative of his beliefs in social engagement, human rights, and political activism, and the Fountain has served as a fitting reminder of these values in one of the city's primary sites for public discourse, political protests, and civic gathering.

The [San Francisco Arts Commission](#) states that:

“The mission of the Civic Art Collection is to promote a rich, diverse and stimulating cultural environment in order to enrich the lives of the city's residents, visitors and employees, and to enhance the city's image both nationally and internationally.”

As a coalition of local, national, and international groups representing not only San Francisco residents, but also artists, preservationists, architects, tourists, historians, academics, professionals, and government interests from *around the world*, **we affirm that both Embarcadero Plaza and the Vaillancourt Fountain directly further this mission.**

These landmarks are *already* internationally recognized, fulfilling San Francisco's desire to elevate these spaces to world-class status. Removing them would *diminish* the city's image both nationally and internationally.

When Lawrence Halprin created Embarcadero Plaza, he looked to Europe for inspiration. His experiences studying European cities established his love of pedestrian-oriented public spaces and informed his signature design approach. European plazas like [Venice's Piazza San Marco](#), [Brussels' Grand-Place](#), [London's Trafalgar Square](#), [Prague's Old Town Square](#), [Siena's Piazza del Campo](#), [Madrid's Plaza Mayor](#), and [Vatican City's St. Peter's Square](#), among so many others, illustrate the long-term success of these adaptable pedestrian spaces.

These successful, timeless spaces share key features: durable hardscaping, numerous paths of travel, and immense flexibility. They largely lack the programmatic elements proposed for this renovation, such as dedicated picnic areas, dog parks, donor recognition area, or a central stage. World-class public spaces are defined by their adaptability, not by prescribed activities. We, who have global expertise in the matter, can assure you that these features will *not* result in a world-class park, for world-class spaces do *not* have them.

We recognize that, naturally, there will be debate over what retention and rehabilitation would look like. We embrace and encourage this debate, which is a sign of a healthy democracy. Not everything can—or should—be preserved. A healthy urban environment requires a mixture of historic and new. However, the current process seems designed to minimize debate, favoring a blank-slate approach that erases a significant layer of San Francisco's history and values. This raises several serious questions.

On a local level, unanswered questions permeate the project. Why focus only on Embarcadero Plaza North and Sue Bierman Park East and avoid sharing the potential "Phase 2" that encompasses some or all of the remaining four acres? What prompted the lack of disclosure of one of the oldest public-private park partnerships in San Francisco's history, that in 1979 the city said "*...set a noble example to the entire community by being the first major corporation to "Adopt A Park" in San Francisco*"? Why not collaborate with experts and willing volunteers to right-size the budget and use existing public art and space to meet the needs of residents and support downtown's economic recovery?

These and numerous other unanswered questions lead to our fundamental request: **The future of Embarcadero Plaza and the Vaillancourt Fountain must be determined in the San Francisco tradition; transparently, equitably, and factually, free of carefully steered narratives and revisionist history.**

As a coalition of local, national, and international groups committed to elevating global artwork and design in the context of San Francisco's unique heritage, we urge the Recreation and Park Department, the Project Governance Team, and all associated city agencies and partners to change course. We ask you to honor the city's history and **prioritize the retention and rehabilitation** of Embarcadero Plaza and the Vaillancourt Fountain.

Respectfully,
Bob Pullum, Board Member, Docomomo US/NOCA,

On behalf of our esteemed organizational and individual partners.

Signatories

Armand Vaillancourt
and the Vaillancourt family

Keith Park, President
California Garden & Landscape History Society



Liz Waytkus, Executive Director
Todd Grover, VP Advocacy
Docomomo US

do.co.mo.mo_US®

Grethe Pontoppidan, Co-President
ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on
Twentieth Century Heritage (ISC 20C)



Jean-François Bélisle
Directeur général
Musée des beaux-arts du Canada



Todd Mayberry, Executive Director
San Francisco Historical Society



Charles A. Birnbaum, FASLA, FAAR, President +
CEO
Nord Wennerstrom, Director of Communications
The Cultural Landscape Foundation (TCLF)

The Cultural Landscape Foundation®
connecting people to places®

Daria Halprin and Rana Halprin
On behalf of the Halprin family

Cindy Heitzman, Executive Director
California Preservation Foundation



Chad DeWitt, Vice President
Bob Pullum, Camila Baum,
Petra Marar, Board Members
Docomomo US/Northern California

do.co.mo.mo_US_noca

Stéphan La Roche, Director
Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal



Woody LaBounty
President & CEO
San Francisco Heritage



Priya Jain, Chair, Heritage Conservation Committee
Society of Architectural Historians (SAH)



About us (alphabetical)

Armand Vaillancourt and the Vaillancourt family

[Armand Vaillancourt](#) is a Québécois sculptor, painter, and performance artist in Canada. For over 60 years, he employed painting, sculpture, and performance to explore social and political issues. His works include: *Justice et Paix* (1986) in Wilfrid-Bastien Park, Saint-Léonard, Québec, *L'Enchantement* (2007) at Cirque du Soleil's International Headquarters in Montréal, *L'Éveil Collectif* in Gaspé, Québec, *Justice* (1980) on the grounds of the Québec Courthouse in Québec City, and *Québec Libre!* (now *Vaillancourt Fountain*), his only public U.S. artwork.

California Garden & Landscape History Society (CGLHS)

[California Garden and Landscape History Society](#) is a private nonprofit 501(c)(3) membership organization devoted to celebrating the beauty and diversity of California's historic gardens and landscapes; promoting wider knowledge, preservation, and restoration of California's historic gardens and landscapes; organizing study visits to historic gardens and landscapes as well as to relevant archives and libraries; and offering opportunities for a lively interchange among members at meetings, garden visits and other events. The Society organizes annual conferences and publishes *Eden*, a quarterly newsletter. Contact us: info@cglhs.org.

California Preservation Foundation (CPF)

The California Preservation Foundation (CPF) is a 501(c)(3) membership-based nonprofit dedicated to protecting California's diverse historic and cultural resources through advocacy, education, and community engagement. For over 46 years, CPF has led statewide efforts to preserve and rehabilitate historic sites, trained thousands of professionals and volunteers, and built a strong network of advocates committed to ensuring preservation remains a vital part of California's future. Contact us: cpf@californiapreservation.org.

Docomomo US

[Docomomo US](#) is a national non-profit organization that advocates for the preservation of Modern architecture, landscapes and design. It is led by a national Board of Directors and staff that represents a union of regional chapters. Docomomo US was founded in the United States in 1995 and is a committee of Docomomo International. Docomomo US' mission is pushing boundaries to preserve modern architecture, landscapes, and design through principled advocacy, collaboration, and celebration. Contact us: info@docomomo-us.org.

Docomomo US/Northern California (NOCA)

[Docomomo US/Northern California](#) is a nonprofit membership organization that promotes the study, interpretation, documentation, and protection of the architecture, landscape, and urban design of the Modern Movement in Northern California. Docomomo is an acronym for the DOcumentation and CONservation of buildings, sites, and neighborhoods of the MODern MOVement. Founded in 1996, Docomomo US/NOCA is one of twenty regional chapters of Docomomo US. Contact us: info@docomomo-noca.org.

ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage (ISC20C)

[ISC20C](#) is ICOMOS' expert scientific committee, dedicated to conserving and celebrating 20th-century heritage most at risk from lack of recognition, and driving its protection through research, advocacy, and policy. The [International Council on Monuments and Sites \(ICOMOS\)](#) is a non-governmental organisation working to conserve and protect cultural heritage sites around the world founded in 1965. [Contact us](#).

Lawrence Halprin and the Halprin family

[Lawrence Halprin](#) (1916-2009) was an American landscape architect, designer, and teacher. Halprin was awarded numerous honors such as the American Institute of Architects Medal for Allied Professions (1964), Fellow of the American Society of Landscape Architects ASLA Design Medal (2003), American Academy of Arts and Sciences (1978), the University of Virginia Thomas Jefferson Medal in Architecture (1979), and the National Medal of Arts (2002), the nation's highest honor for an artist. Halprin published several books including *RSVP Cycles*, *Taking Part*, *Cities*, *Freeways*, and *Notebooks*.

Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal (MAC)

The [Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal](#) was founded in 1964 by the Québec government, at the instigation of artists and collectors who wanted to see an institution established to build a collection of contemporary works by artists from Montréal, Québec, Canada and around the world. Canada's premier museum dedicated exclusively to contemporary art, the MAC is committed to demonstrating the fundamental role played by contemporary art in our society. With a history that already spans half a century, the Musée pursues its mission with ever greater conviction: to make known, promote and preserve Québec contemporary art and ensure a place for international contemporary art through acquisitions, exhibitions and other activities. Contact us: relations.presse@macm.org.

Musée des beaux-arts du Canada (National Gallery of Canada)

Founded in 1880, the National Gallery of Canada is among the world's most respected art institutions. As a national museum, we exist to serve all Canadians, no matter where they live. We do this by sharing our collection, exhibitions and public programming widely. We create dynamic experiences that allow for new ways of seeing ourselves and each other through the visual arts, while centering Indigenous ways of knowing and being. Our mandate is to develop, preserve and present a collection for the learning and enjoyment of all—now and for generations to come. We are home to more than [90,000 works](#), including one of the finest collections of Indigenous and Canadian art, major works from the 14th to the 21st century and extensive library and archival holdings. Contact us: info@gallery.ca.

Fondé en 1880, le Musée des beaux-arts du Canada compte parmi les institutions artistiques les plus respectées au monde. En tant que musée national, notre raison d'être est de servir toutes les Canadiennes et tous les Canadiens, où qu'ils vivent. Pour ce faire, nous partageons largement notre collection, nos expositions et notre programmation publique. Nous créons des expériences dynamiques qui permettent de nouvelles façons de nous voir et de voir les autres à travers les arts visuels, tout en mettant l'accent sur les façons autochtones de savoir et d'être. Notre mandat consiste à développer, préserver et présenter une collection pour l'apprentissage et le plaisir de toutes et tous — aujourd'hui et pour les générations à venir. Nous abritons plus de [90 000 œuvres](#), dont l'une des plus belles collections d'art autochtone et canadien, des œuvres majeures du 14^e au 21^e siècle, ainsi que de vastes fonds de bibliothèque et d'archives. Nous joindre: info@beaux-arts.ca.

San Francisco Heritage (SF Heritage)

[San Francisco Heritage \(SF Heritage\)](#) is a nonprofit whose mission is to preserve and enhance San Francisco's unique architectural and cultural identity. Since 1971, SF Heritage has protected the city in the face of rapid change. This includes advocacy for historic resources, educational programming, and the preservation and interpretation of two landmark properties. Contact us: info@sfheritage.org.

San Francisco Historical Society (SFHS)

SFHS is a 501(c)3 nonprofit organization devoted to bringing together San Francisco's past, present and future. SFHS has more than 2,000 members and fulfills its mission of preserving Bay Area history through a broad spectrum of programs and special events, such as monthly presentations, guided history walks, the Barbary Coast Trail and the annual Awards Luncheon.

The Society produces two publications: [The Argonaut](#), a beautiful journal featuring photographs and in-depth reviews of our city's history; and [Panorama](#), a quarterly newsletter for members that features upcoming programs and events of interest to our members. Contact us: info@sfhistory.org.

Society of Architectural Historians (SAH)

The [Society of Architectural Historians](#) (SAH) promotes the study, interpretation, and conservation of architecture, design, landscapes, and urbanism worldwide for the benefit of all. Founded at Harvard University in 1940, the Society of Architectural Historians is a nonprofit membership organization that serves an international network of institutions and individuals who, by profession or interest, focus on the history of the built environment and its role in shaping contemporary life. Contact us: info@sah.org.

The Cultural Landscape Foundation® (TCLF)

[The Cultural Landscape Foundation](#) (TCLF), is a Washington, D.C.-based 501(c)(3) non-profit founded in 1998 to connect people to places. TCLF educates and engages the public to make our shared landscape heritage more visible, identify its value, and empower its stewards. Through its [website](#), publishing, lectures, and other events, TCLF broadens support and understanding for cultural landscapes. TCLF is also home to the [Cornelia Hahn Oberlander International Landscape Architecture Prize](#). Contact us: info@tclf.org.

Re: Projet de rénovation de l'Embarcadero Plaza et du parc Sue Bierman

À qui de droit,

Certains de nos groupes se sont déjà entretenus avec vous individuellement au sujet de ce projet, mais nous vous écrivons aujourd'hui afin de témoigner du large consensus existant — au niveau local, national et international — autour d'un principe fondamental : **l'Embarcadero Plaza et la Fontaine Vaillancourt doivent être conservés et restaurés pour les générations actuelles et futures, qu'il s'agisse de résidents ou de visiteurs.**

L'Embarcadero Plaza et la Fontaine Vaillancourt ont vu le jour à une époque où le centre-ville de San Francisco se transformait pour devenir une métropole moderne d'après-guerre. Ce projet a été rendu possible grâce à la prospérité de l'époque, au financement fédéral pour la rénovation urbaine et à la conviction des dirigeants municipaux que l'art et les espaces publics de qualité devaient être accessibles à tous. Le célèbre architecte-paysagiste Lawrence Halprin a conçu la Plaza, et le sculpteur québécois Armand Vaillancourt a remporté le concours international organisé pour la conception de la fontaine, un projet qui a précédé et inspiré les programmes modernes de type « un pour cent pour l'art ».

Comme dans la quasi-totalité des réalisations d'Halprin, l'eau y joue un rôle central, et la fontaine de Vaillancourt fut retenue pour la puissance de sa vision artistique et sa conviction profonde de l'importance de la participation, de l'interaction et de la découverte du public. L'inspiration initiale d'Halprin pour l'Embarcadero Plaza venait des plazas espagnoles et des piazzas italiennes, qui depuis des siècles servent de lieux de rassemblement, de célébration, de repas en plein air et d'expression publique.

N'est-ce pas là l'objectif déclaré de la rénovation actuelle ?

Réaménager entièrement cette place reviendrait à envoyer un message clair : San Francisco n'a pas encore appris à créer et entretenir des espaces publics de calibre mondial, alors que d'autres civilisations y sont parvenues depuis longtemps.

Nous — y compris l'artiste lui-même — rejetons les déformations et la négligence répétées dont la Fontaine Vaillancourt a été victime. Cette œuvre, qui représente environ 2,5 % de la superficie totale de l'Embarcadero Plaza et du parc Sue Bierman, n'a jamais été pensée comme un objet unique destiné à contraster avec une autoroute. Elle a été conçue comme une sculpture abstraite, autonome, vouée à l'interprétation, à l'interaction et à l'émotion. Comme toute œuvre majeure, elle continue d'évoluer et de s'adapter avec le temps et avec son public. Depuis sa création, la fontaine suscite la controverse — mais cette controverse, loin de la diminuer, est au cœur de son rôle : provoquer le dialogue et susciter l'engagement. Dire le contraire, c'est ignorer son histoire et l'intention de son créateur.

La fontaine, initialement intitulée « Québec Libre! », demeure l'unique installation publique de l'artiste aux États-Unis. Elle est non seulement l'œuvre artistique la plus reconnaissable de San Francisco, mais aussi une œuvre littéralement unique. Son titre d'origine souligne qu'elle explore les idées de liberté politique et personnelle, dans un contexte où l'artiste offrait parallèlement son atelier comme refuge à des militants autochtones associés à l'occupation de l'île d'Alcatraz (1969-1971). L'art de Vaillancourt est intimement lié à ses engagements sociaux, à la défense des droits humains et à l'activisme politique. La fontaine est donc un rappel vivant de ces valeurs, au cœur même d'un lieu qui est depuis toujours un espace majeur de discours public, de manifestations politiques et de rassemblements citoyens.

[La Commission des arts de San Francisco](#) affirme que :

« La mission de la collection d'art civique est de promouvoir un environnement culturel riche, diversifié et stimulant afin d'enrichir la vie des résidents, des visiteurs et des employés de la ville, et d'améliorer l'image de la ville tant à l'échelle nationale qu'internationale. »

En tant que coalition regroupant des acteurs locaux, nationaux et internationaux — incluant des artistes, des défenseurs du patrimoine, des architectes, des historiens, des universitaires, des professionnels, des touristes et des organismes gouvernementaux — **nous affirmons que l’Embarcadero Plaza et la Fontaine Vaillancourt contribuent directement à cette mission.**

Ces lieux sont déjà reconnus à l’échelle internationale et permettent à San Francisco de revendiquer un statut de ville de calibre mondial. Leur suppression aurait l’effet inverse : elle affaiblirait gravement l’image de la ville, tant aux États-Unis qu’à l’étranger.

Lorsque Lawrence Halprin a imaginé l’Embarcadero Plaza, il s’est inspiré de ses expériences européennes. Il y avait étudié et observé la force des espaces publics piétonniers, qui ont façonné son approche de conception. Les places emblématiques comme [la Piazza San Marco à Venise](#), [la Grand-Place de Bruxelles](#), [Trafalgar Square à Londres](#), [la Place de la Vieille Ville de Prague](#), [la Piazza del Campo à Sienne](#), [la Plaza Mayor à Madrid](#) ou [la Place Saint-Pierre du Vatican](#) démontrent que ces espaces, adaptables et durables, continuent à prospérer depuis des siècles.

Ces lieux intemporels partagent des caractéristiques essentielles : une grande durabilité, une multiplicité de parcours et une flexibilité remarquable. À l’inverse, ils ne se définissent pas par des équipements figés comme des aires de pique-nique dédiées, des parcs à chiens, des zones de reconnaissance de donateurs ou une scène centrale. Les espaces publics de classe mondiale se distinguent par leur capacité d’adaptation, et non par une programmation rigide. Nous, qui avons une expertise mondiale en la matière, pouvons affirmer que les caractéristiques proposées dans le projet actuel ne créeront pas un espace de calibre international.

Nous reconnaissons que le débat est légitime et nécessaire sur ce que devraient être la conservation et la restauration. Tout ne peut pas — et ne doit pas — être préservé. Un tissu urbain vivant exige un équilibre entre l’ancien et le nouveau. Mais le processus actuel semble conçu pour limiter le débat, au profit d’une approche de table rase qui efface une couche essentielle de l’histoire et des valeurs de San Francisco. Cela soulève des questions fondamentales : Pourquoi concentrer uniquement les efforts sur la partie nord de l’Embarcadero Plaza et l’est du parc Sue Bierman, en omettant la « Phase 2 » potentielle qui couvre les quatre acres restants ? Pourquoi ne pas avoir divulgué l’existence d’un des premiers partenariats public-privé de parcs de San Francisco, créé en 1979 et salué à l’époque comme « un noble exemple pour l’ensemble de la communauté » ? Pourquoi ne pas collaborer avec des experts et des bénévoles prêts à travailler à la redéfinition du budget, en s’appuyant sur l’art public et les infrastructures déjà en place, pour mieux répondre aux besoins des résidents et soutenir la relance économique du centre-ville ?

Ces questions, et bien d’autres encore, renforcent notre appel central : **l’avenir de l’Embarcadero Plaza et de la Fontaine Vaillancourt doit être décidé dans la tradition démocratique de San Francisco — de manière transparente, équitable et fondée sur des faits, sans récits biaisés ni réécriture de l’histoire.**

En tant que coalition d’acteurs locaux, nationaux et internationaux, attachés à la valeur de l’art et du design dans le patrimoine unique de San Francisco, nous exhortons le Recreation and Park Department, l’équipe de gouvernance du projet et l’ensemble des partenaires de la Ville à changer de cap. Nous vous demandons d’honorer l’histoire de la ville et **de donner la priorité à la conservation et à la restauration** de l’Embarcadero Plaza et de la Fontaine Vaillancourt.

Respectueusement,

Bob Pullum

Membre du conseil d’administration, Docomomo US/NOCA
Au nom de nos partenaires organisationnels et individuels

From: [Gary Strang](#)
To: [SauterStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Ginsburg, Phil \(REC\)](#); [Commission, Recpark \(REC\)](#); [Madland, Sarah \(REC\)](#); [Collins, Charles \(ART\)](#); [ART-Info](#); [Matsuda, Diane \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Aaron Fenton](#); [Robbie Silver](#); [info@downtownsf.org](#)
Subject: Support for Vaillancourt Fountain at Embarcadero Plaza
Date: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 9:27:05 AM
Attachments: [251013 - In Support of the Vaillancourt Fountain at Embarcadero Plaza.pdf](#)

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors, Mayor Lurie, and Commissioners,

Please see the attached pdf letter expressing support for the reinvigoration of Vaillancourt Fountain as an integral driver of future park improvements, and opposition to its impending demolition.

Thank you for your time and commitment to shaping San Francisco's future.

Gary Strang FASLA | FAIA

Principal

GLS Landscape | Architecture

2677 Mission Street #200

San Francisco, CA 94110

415.285.3614 x 501

415.420.7266 cell

www.glsarch.com

gary@glisarch.com



In Support of the Vaillancourt Fountain at Embarcadero Plaza

My name is Gary Strang. I am a Fellow of the AIA as well as the ASLA. I have been practicing in San Francisco with a studio of 10-15 people since the early 1990s, addressing issues exactly like Vaillancourt Fountain that fall between the disciplines of architecture, landscape architecture and urban design. For 15 years, my team worked on the relocation of the Exploratorium to Pier 15, where we were ultimately responsible for the two acres of public and semi-public waterfront outdoor space that has come to be known as the outdoor Exploratorium. I am the Vice Chair of the BCDC (Bay Conservation and Development Commission) Design Review Board where I have served for the last 10 years; these comments do not represent BCDC.

I am writing to express my opinion and deep concern regarding the impending demolition of the Vaillancourt Fountain.

Great cities, the ones we choose to vacation in and to educate our children, are heavily activated by people precisely because they have accumulated many layers of architecture that record and represent significant and meaningful points in history. It would be shortsighted to wipe away this artifact which is an important product of the historic late 1960s era in the Bay Area. It represents a legacy of a unique community of influential designers, of which there were many besides Vaillancourt and Lawrence Halprin of Sea Ranch fame. A family tree of Halprin's office would show that an extraordinary number of architects, landscape architects and urban designers practicing locally and internationally today passed through or were trained by those who passed through Halprin's office at this time. Halprin is responsible for launching the career of San Francisco's own supergraphics inventor, Barbara Stauffacher Solomon, who was a mentor and friend for over 35 years.

The fountain is energetic and audacious in a way that is unlikely to be repeated in San Francisco's foreseeable future. Replacing it with lawn and trees would be a safe and uninteresting downgrade that erases the memory of the energy of San Francisco at that tumultuous and optimistic time, when the Embarcadero Freeway separated the downtown from the water's edge. Halprin was the first landscape architect to embrace cities and infrastructure in his work. He brought the same degree of intelligence to this design as he did to his other celebrated projects. The fountain masked the noise of the adjacent freeway and borrowed the blocky concrete forms of the freeway so that the sculpture would not be lost against the massive elevated structure. In traditional landscape design, this is referred to as "borrowed scenery." Importantly, the wall at the back of the fountain creates a strategically placed windbreak and a south-facing open space, dealing with the perennial issue of the Ferry Building outdoor space, which is the freezing wind.

In the hands of an equally bold and thoughtful contemporary designer, the sculpture could be incorporated into the new park design and reinvigorated in a contemporary way that need not require expensive pumps and chemicals. The concrete forms should be animated with water seasonally in a modest way that informs the design of the entire park by channeling our infrequent and heavier rains. When the Embarcadero is raised, creating a levee, drainage to the Bay will be impeded, and the basin could serve as a catchment area that is part of the contemporary solution. The mass of the fountain also provides an intermediate scale in the vastness of the Embarcadero open space between buildings; it frames the Ferry Building when

viewed from Market Street and it provides welcome perceptual separation from the traffic on the Embarcadero. San Francisco is only now recovering from the acknowledged mistakes of post war urban renewal, so it should not be controversial to acknowledge that buildings thought to be ugly or beyond repair are actually irreplaceable resources. Reuse is often more cost effective than building new if we calculate the long term costs and energy required to remove the foundations.

Vaillancourt's lifelong work is an act of free expression and resistance against oppression. He was outspoken in support of the native Americans who occupied Alcatraz during fountain construction. What does it say about the future of San Francisco as a leader in social and environmental issues to replace something provocative with rolling lawns? The fountain should serve as an historic anchor to whatever park improvements transpire. Instead of begrudging accommodating of the fountain with an unrelated design, as has been proposed, the park should be designed with the requirement that the fountain be fully integrated as a driver in the reinvigoration of the entire park. It would be a great loss to double down on the stylistic preferences of the moment and lose this history for future generations.

Sincerely



Gary Strang, FASLA, FAIA
Principal
GLS Landscape | Architecture

Please include this letter in the following public policy body meetings and public records, either for the date specified or the soonest scheduled.

*Arts Commission - Full Commission Meeting - November 3, 2025
Board of Supervisors Meeting - October 14, 2025
Arts Commission - Visual Arts Committee Meeting - October 15, 2025
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting - October 15, 2025
Recreation and Park Commission Meeting - October 16, 2025*

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Bill 250192 Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 9:42:00 AM
Attachments: [Public commnt 250192 100625 LSPC and LAAW.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Legal Services for Prisoners with Children and Legal Aid at Work regarding File No. 250192, which is Item No. 1 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

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

Sincerely,

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

From: Eric Sapp <erics@prisonerswithchildren.org>

Sent: Monday, October 6, 2025 1:55 PM

To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Bill 250192 Public Comment

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please find attached a public comment on bill number 250192 (Administrative, Labor and Employment Codes), also known as the Open for Business Contract Streamlining Act.

It is jointly submitted by nonprofit organizations Legal Services for Prisoners with Children and Legal Aid at Work.

Sincerely,

Eric C. Sapp

Staff Attorney

Legal Services for Prisoners with Children

4400 Market Street, Oakland, CA 94608

tele: (415) 625-7046

erics@prisonerswithchildren.org



Legal Services for Prisoners with Children
4400 Market Street, Oakland, CA 94608

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

October 6, 2025

Re: Public Comment on File No. **250192**
(Administrative, Labor and Employment Codes –
City Contract Processes and Requirements)

Dear President Rafael Mandelman, Supervisors, and To Whom It May Concern,

Bill file number 250192 passed its first reading on September 30th unanimously. It occupied the Board for a total of *sixteen seconds* at that session. Given the sweeping range of reforms the bill would institute, it is imperative that the Board give it greater consideration. If some of the details of the bill were carefully examined, they would be found to be highly objectionable.

The repeal of Article 142 of the Labor and Employment Code is especially concerning, as it would mark a retreat from San Francisco's role of statewide and national leadership in fair chance employment, or ban-the-box style principles in hiring. The rationale proponents have provided for such a drastic rollback of local protection is wholly inadequate to justify the repeal. Article 142 is discussed in Part II, *infra*. Fairness of opportunity results from placing constraints on employers' prejudicial utilization of background checks. A thriving economy alleviates the social dislocation caused by mass incarceration and decades of discriminatory policing of communities of color. Public policy can accomplish this by preventing exclusions from work opportunities based solely on records of criminal legal system interactions. Exclusionary hiring and employment practices create barriers for persons reentering the non-carceral workforce after periods of incarceration. Article 142 shields applicants and employees from unfair processes of

exclusion. While not perfect, Art. 142 provides protections that *complement* the provisions of state statutes and are consistent with, even when extending protection further than, the latter. To repeal Art. 142 merely because they overlap in part would be a mistake that ignores the complementary functioning of local and state laws.

I. An Omnibus, Yet Erratic, Wrecking Ball in the Guise of Efficiency

This bill¹ would amend or repeal numerous provisions of local law, with the purported aim of streamlining city contracts. These changes range from repealing a ban on business with Burma/Myanmar, which prohibition (Admin. Code Ch. 12J) has been in suspension for a quarter century and so is “a legislative clean-up measure with no material effect” (Revised Legislative Digest, 9/17/25 [hereinafter “Digest”], p. 5) to limiting the application of the Nondiscrimination in Contracting rules to contracts valued over a threshold of \$230K (Labor and Employment Code, Art. 131, Sec. 131.2; Digest, p. 3). Thankfully, much of the latter’s protections against discrimination will remain in force as a consequence of state or federal antidiscrimination laws. However, the message the City and County of San Francisco is sending to the world is that, as far as its own contracting and subcontracting is concerned, it does not care whether the contractors practice discrimination on the basis of “race, color, creed, religion, national origin, ancestry, Age, Sex, Sexual orientation, Gender Identity, Gender Expression, domestic partner status, marital status, Disability, Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome, AIDS/HIV status, weight, or height” *as long as the contract clocks in for* (say) a mere \$229,999. That message is not helping small businesses; it is encouraging them to adopt a lackadaisical attitude toward vital principles of civil rights.

Other sections of the bill would do such things as reaffirm the “MacBride Principles”, concerning doing business in Northern Ireland, albeit emphasizing the plainly hortatory, nonbinding character of the principles and despite concerns that such principles are in conflict with First Amendment principles.²

The most extensive discussion of the bill at the Board level transpired on July 15 of this year. While the proponents of the bill touted the benefits of the bill as streamlining the contracting process, fostering competitive bidding and making San Francisco an attractive city in which to do business, several Supervisors rightly raised concerns with the bill’s elimination of

¹ Unless otherwise stated, or implied by context, references to the bill or to 250192 denotes the fourth version, as amended in committee on September 17, 2025.

² Sec. 12F.4(c)(3) of the Admin. Code (corresponding to the old 12F.3.C) would call on businesses to commit to “Banning provocative or religious or political emblems from the workplace. Each signatory to the MacBride Principles must make reasonable, good-faith efforts to prevent the display of provocative sectarian emblems at their plants in Northern Ireland.” The new version adds that this is merely an exhortation, not an obligation (Sec. 12F.5(b)).

the Sweatshop Advisory Group, a commission long tasked with monitoring compliance with the existing requirements of Art. 151 of the Labor and Employment Code. Due to the objections of these Supervisors, and the advocacy of organized labor groups, upon a narrow vote the bill returned to committee for further review of its sweatshop-related provisions.

What happened subsequently was that the Sweatshop Advisory Group was retained in form, while the *substance* of the sweatfree ordinance will be gutted by this bill. In versions both before and after July 15th, the scope of the anti-sweatshop ordinance had been severely curtailed. Existing law applies to all “goods,” as well as materials and equipment. Bill 250192 limits the coverage solely to garments and apparel (“Covered Goods”, Sec 151.3). Are signs or the materials for roads and buildings generated through systematically onerous working conditions for sub-poverty wages or child labor (Sec. 151.4(b))? No problem. Are the food and beverages purchased by the City from contractors running establishments that compel employee pregnancy tests (Ibid.)? Not a problem. Is Slave Labor used to extract materials for municipal infrastructure (Ibid.; see also Sec. 151.3)? Again, no problem. None of that is covered under the new sweatshop law’s prohibitions. Only apparel and garments – and not even all apparel and garments. The exclusions carved out of the Covered Goods are wide: “goods [...] incidental to the provision of the service; (2) apparel and garments procured for a public works related contract, such as safety vests and helmets; and (3) uniforms, garments, and shoes that require special production processes to ensure the safety of the wearer in the fulfillment of public health and public safety, including but not limited to: firefighting gear, neoprene gloves, ballistic vests and body armor, helmet covers, medical gowns, personal protective equipment, or similar items.” (Sec. 151.3.) What the Board is effectively stating with this exclusion is that if you’ve got to run a sweatshop to produce PPE, so be it. What’s a bit of workplace sexual harassment if the products being produced are firefighting gear or ballistic vests? Accordingly, bill 250192 does much more than define the role of a Sweatshop Advisory Group. In its current form, it *condones sweatshops* as long as they are not in the business of producing (non-safety equipment) clothing.

II. Repealing Art. 142 is Counterproductive

At the July 15th session, when this Board as a whole most extensively discussed the proposed ordinance, Supervisor Mahmood characterized the bill as primarily about “small value contracts.”³ Though it is true that some sections of the bill differentiate the regulations at play depending on threshold of monetary value at stake in the contract, as already stated, some of them do not so restrict the scope. The straight repeal of Article 142 of the Labor and Employment Code is one such component.

³ <https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/player/clip/50412>

Existing Article 142 does not apply to cumulative transactions below a threshold of \$5,000 per annum (existing Sec. 142.1). It applies to “all” contracts with the City and County above that threshold (existing Sec. 142.3). The new Labor and Employment Code would thus move toward the creation of a *laissez faire* hiring regime for all contractors, be they small, medium, or large.

Section 142.2, as it currently exists, is overall a coherent, and reasonably limited, scheme of employment regulation. Current law states that “the protections of this Article apply only to applicants and employees who would be or are performing work in furtherance of performing a Contract or Property Contract with the City.” Section 142.3 mandates compliance by Contractors and Subcontractors for such work arrangements. Section 142.4 lays out the procedure for the compliant use of criminal history information. Subdivision (a) of that Section prohibits inquiry, required disclosure, or adverse actions based on: (1) arrests not leading to conviction (except when a case is still pending); (2) participation in diversion or deferral of judgment programs; (3) expunged, dismissed, or invalidated convictions; (4) juvenile adjudications; (5) convictions more than seven years after sentencing; (6) infractions unless related to a motor vehicle record in situations where the job involves driving; and (7) offenses since decriminalized, such as certain cannabis-related offenses. The Contractors and Subcontractors are prohibited from communicating to the effect that any and every arrest or conviction disqualifies an applicant (Sec 142.4(j)). They can conduct background checks and are not prohibited from using convictions not contained in the list of (a)(1) through (7) for adverse action decisions but *only after* a conditional offer has been made (subd. (c)). Individualized assessments are required to ensure that only accurate and “Directly Related”⁴ convictions are considered for the job (subd. (f)). Furthermore, in the event of an adverse action decision, the applicant or employee must be notified, given a copy of the background report, and given reasonable time to reply with challenges of inaccuracy or to offer mitigating factors or evidence of rehabilitation (subd. (g)-(h)). This helps to ensure that unnecessary exclusions from work, based on prejudicial attitudes, do not operate in the employment process. Record-keeping requirements (Sec. 142.7) allow for accountability while maintaining personnel’s interests in privacy.

The bill’s proponents have given no convincing reasons for a need or even benefit of eliminating Art. 142’s coherent, and reasonably limited, scheme of employment regulation . In fact, they have given almost no explanation at all.

The explanations they have offered make little sense. The Office of the City Administrator’s July 9, 2025 presentation on the “Open for Business Contract Streamlining Act of 2025” focused almost entirely on other sections of the bill. A mere *sentence fragment* on slide 9 reports that Article 142 has “Significant overlap with California state law” and posits, without

⁴ “Directly Related Convictions” is cross-referenced to the Police Code, Sec 4903.

further argument, that this overlap justifies repeal. The *overlap justifies repeal* position is replicated in the Digest, this time getting two sentences within a short paragraph:

Article 142 has significant overlap with Section 12952 of the California Government Code. In effect, it requires contractors to determine whether to apply San Francisco law or California law or both, making contracting with the City more difficult. (Digest, p.5)

The Digest also buttresses the argument with an assertion that “Enforcement actions by San Francisco have historically been limited.” (Ibid.) That’s basically the extent of the official rationale. The enforcement argument will be addressed in the next Part of this Comment.

The overlap problem is a non-issue; the bill’s overlap with state law is neither inconsistency nor incompatibility. That one level in a multilevel system of government may have greater or lesser restrictions in a particular area of law and policy is not a novel situation; it is a ubiquitous feature of federalism and of local government’s interaction with a central state. The proponents have not pointed to any conflict or contradiction created by the ordinance. Article 142 is logically compatible with CA Government Code Section 12952.

There is no inconsistency where stronger rights, and corresponding duties, are imposed at a local level than at the state level. Unless state preemption applies, both the local protection and the state protection are applicable. If preemption applies, the state prevails to the exclusion of the local. Here, the state law, which the Digest cited, expressly addresses the issue. There is no difficulty for contractors to “determine whether to apply San Francisco law or California law or both” (Digest, p. 5) because the state law already gives the answer: *both*.

Subdivision (e) of Government Code §12952 says: “The remedies under this section shall be in addition to and not in derogation of all other rights and remedies that an applicant may have under any other law, including any local ordinance.” State regulations specify that in this context “applicant” typically includes existing employees. 2 C.C.R. § 11017.1(j). Accordingly, this means that the state level protection of workers and prospective workers is intended to be supplemented by protections at the local level. Conversely, a local ordinance that offers less protection to those workers is superseded by the state law. This is clear and poses no logical difficulty. If employers are confused, it is through an ignorance of the law that can be easily remedied through the provisions of the contract instruments themselves and accompanying documentation. That some employers may not be *pleased* by the requirements they are expected to comply with, is not the same thing as the requirements being unclear. They are clear.

A few examples illustrate how this functions. The ordinance gives the worker seven days (Sec. 142.4(h)), from receiving notice about the intended adverse action, in which to notify the employer of the worker’s intent to challenge the decision. The state statute gives them at least

five business days. Gov. Code §12952(c)(3). If the occurrence of a holiday implies that five business days renders the deadline later than seven (calendar) days, then the person gets the longer period of the two. Subsequent to the notice of intent to challenge the decision, the worker gets a minimum of another five business days under state law (Ibid.) to proffer their evidence or explanation, etc. The equivalent stage of the ordinance affords them a “reasonable” period of time (Sec. 142.4(h)). In the event that the submission in question would reasonably take longer than five plus five business days to complete – say, if a government record has been requested and is estimated to take longer to process – it may be that a reasonable time is longer. In that instance, the ordinance provides greater protection to the worker/applicant and should prevail, according to the rule of the statute (Gov. Code §12952(e)). A reasonableness standard is a common feature of life under the civil law and does not create any untoward paradox or burden.

Ironically, other situations of overlap are recognized by other parts of the bill, as well as by the existing ordinance, raising further questions about the legitimacy of this argument by its proponents. The current Sec. 142.4(e) recognizes overlap between the ordinance’s background check provisions and federal and state consumer reporting laws, FRCA and ICRAA respectively, and specifies that compliance with *all of the above* is necessary. Elsewhere in the bill under consideration, in the portion on sweatshops,⁵ Sec. 151.4(b)(1)(C) defines its minimum standards such that they do “not preempt or limit any other applicable law, regulation or requirement, or decision by a private entity, that requires a higher level of compensation or rights.” A race to the top, then, not a race to the bottom, is what workers want and what good governance gives.

III. How to Fix the Bill

There are ways to enhance, rather than repeal, Article 142. An express provision (added to Sec. 142.1) stating that the local protections against discrimination in employment based on criminal record history are in addition to the protections at the state level would achieve this. Contractors and subcontractors are expected to rise up to the ideal of fairness, not race to the bottom.

As noted previously, the Digest also indicated that local enforcement of Article 142 has been “limited.” What exactly this means, and whether it needs remedying, could usefully be explored by returning the bill to committee for practical analysis. It could be that employers are complying with Article 142 and it is working as intended: hardly a reason to get rid of it. It could also mean that the OLSE’s resources or will for enforcement are deficient. Again, that is not a reason to scrap the ordinance but it might be a reason to creatively find ways to strengthen that Office. Finally, it could mean that there is a need for greater public education about the provisions of the ordinance. These possibilities deserve serious examination, which they have not received.

⁵ See Part II, *supra*. for discussion of the sweatshop law.

Sending the bill back to committee⁶ would be preferable to repealing Art. 142. Perhaps a more streamlined approach to the overall legislation, however, would be to remove all those portions of the bill that repeal the sections of Article 142.

For the foregoing reasons, **bill file 250192 should *not* be passed in its present form.** Workers deserve respect for their rights and their dignity. The people of the City and County of San Francisco deserve an economy where fairness reigns and where regulation is sensible, not a policy of pursuing deregulation merely for the sake of deregulation.

Respectfully,



Eric Craig Sapp
Staff Attorney
LEGAL SERVICES FOR PRISONERS WITH CHILDREN

Molly Lao
Staff Attorney
LEGAL AID AT WORK

⁶ The Committee would also be advised to reconsider the sweatshop provisions as discussed in Part II, *supra*.

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: Proposed Ordinance re Ch 19B File No. 250980
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 1:40:33 PM
Attachments: [SFBOS re Ch19B Attorney Fees 10-7-25.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached, from Secure Justice, regarding:

File No. 250980 - Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to delete the provision authorizing a court to award costs and attorney's fees to a plaintiff who is a prevailing party in an action alleging a violation Administrative Code, Chapter 19B, governing the acquisition of Surveillance Technology

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: Brian Hofer <brian@secure-justice.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 1:15 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Proposed Ordinance re Ch 19B

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please see the attached letter.

Brian Hofer

Executive Director



Cell: (510) 303-2871

X personal: @b_haddy

X org: @securejustice

Bluesky personal: brianhofer.bsky.social

Bluesky org: @securejustice.bsky.social

Tik Tok org: @secure.justice

San Francisco Bay Area, CA

secure-justice.org

[Hofer bio](#)

[Donate](#) to Secure Justice

**Disclaimer: This email may contain confidential and privileged material, including attachments, for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) named above. Please do not review, use, copy, forward, or in any way distribute or disclose the contents of this e-mail including any attachments unless you are the intended recipient(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, or authorized to receive this message for the recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and delete all copies of this message.*



October 7, 2025

VIA E-MAIL ONLY

Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
E-Mail: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: False Statements by Supervisor Matt Dorsey

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I write to respond to the multiple false statements recently made by Supervisor Matt Dorsey in his press release, pertaining to his proposed repeal of an attorneys' fee and court cost provision in the surveillance ordinance (Ch. 19B).

Supervisor Dorsey falsely claims that Secure Justice "could reap significant financial rewards" from our lawsuit. This is a lie. He appears to have read the lawsuit but somehow missed that there is no claim for monetary damages. The only relief authorized under 19B is "injunctive relief, declaratory relief, or writ of mandate to remedy the violation..." Sec. 19B.8. Even if Secure Justice was to prevail 100% on all allegations, there will be no judgment providing for money damages.

Second, Supervisor Dorsey again tries to deceive you by implying that attorneys' fees are somehow going to flow to Secure Justice. By law, such an action would be illegal. No attorney is going to risk their livelihood by losing their license for providing a kickback of fees in violation of law and the California Rules of Professional Conduct. Stated simply, Secure Justice can only lose money on this litigation. There cannot and will not be any windfall.

Third, our small entity alone has worked on approximately 40 ordinances across the country, and each comes with an attorneys' fees and court cost provision. Many recent data privacy bills enacted in California likewise includes the same provision, as does the California Public Record Act, state law SB 34 (automatic license plate readers), and a number of your own ordinances including but not limited to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance, Tenant Buyout Agreements, Tenants Rights to Relocation, Circumvention of Tenant Protections, (Ch. 37, multiple enforcement sections), Residential Unit Conversion and Demolition (Ch. 41), and the Sunshine Ordinance (Ch. 67).

An accountability mechanism demonstrates good faith, and the seriousness of the matter, and the city has consistently recognized this as demonstrated by the above ordinances and Chapter 19B. Like the above laws, Chapter 19B serves to both protect important private rights (e.g. privacy) and public rights (e.g. transparency, accountability).

What the Supervisor falsely claims as mere “paperwork deficiencies” is literally the most important part of the oversight framework created by 19B – the rules pertaining to the use of powerful surveillance technologies, including what data is collected, and with whom it may be shared and under what conditions. Enacted in 2019, SFPD was required to get Board approved use policies in place for 40+ technologies. SFPD has simply refused to do so, having had more than ample time to complete the task that other San Francisco departments are capable of. For the past 5 years, neither the Mayor, Board, nor City Attorney have directed SFPD to comply. There was no choice but to litigate and have the court order performance.

The rules of use are critical to the protection of civil liberties, *and* to reduce your legal liability. In 2014, you authorized payment of \$495,000 to [Denise Green](#), a 45-year-old Muni driver that was pulled over by SFPD after an automatic license plate reader misidentified her car, seven SFPD officers ended up throwing Ms. Green on the ground, and pointing guns at her head. SFPD had no use policy pertaining to use of the technology, nor how to confirm accuracy of the information received.

In 2015-16, SFPD culture was exposed in a racist and homophobic [texting](#) scandal. SFPD again created a national uproar in 2022, when they used a rape survivor’s [DNA](#) to charge her in an unrelated crime. This led to a federal lawsuit, policy change, and a new state law carried by Senator Wiener.

It was only this year that SFPD was released from a nine-year federal and subsequent state [oversite program](#), which arose due to SFPD’s disturbing use of force rate, racial disparities in stop, searches, and use of force.

Just several months ago, the SF Standard exposed SFPD’s [illegal data sharing](#) and violations of state law governing the use of surveillance technology, as they exposed millions of sensitive location data points to [hostile red states](#) prosecuting individuals seeking reproductive and gender affirming care in San Francisco, in addition to sharing data with ICE.

To look at the above and conclude that SFPD needs less accountability truly boggles the mind. To those of you on the Board that are mindful of your fiduciary duty to the taxpayers of San Francisco, there are two foolproof routes to avoiding expensive litigation: 1) follow the law, or 2) don’t continue to litigate when you have no defense.

Our case is nothing like the ACLU/EFF lawsuit referenced by the Supervisor. Our allegations are primarily failures to perform. SFPD has either submitted and received approval for a use policy, or it hasn’t. There is no defense for these failures to perform. We don’t need five (5) depositions or onerous written discovery to acknowledge what the City can confirm by a review of its own records – these obligations were not performed.


When public entities resist transparency or accountability, attorneys’ fees provisions ensure that individuals and community organizations can still seek justice without bearing the entire financial burden. Removing these provisions would reward delay and gamesmanship, making it harder to resolve matters efficiently and fairly.

It is stunning to see such a proposal as this, in a moment when Palantir and DOGE have illegally copied our most personal and sensitive information, and hackers and ransomware attacks are creating enormous data repositories on the dark web that will enable greater fraud and other crimes to occur.

With ICE actively hunting down our neighbors and kidnapping them in broad daylight, for supervisors to think data privacy and accountability of SFPD is not important, when SFPD is sharing sensitive location data with ICE and red states prosecuting reproductive care and gender affirming care choices, is a troubling sign of the times and what San Francisco has become.

No entity so careless as San Francisco with surveillance technology and data privacy can be called a sanctuary city.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Brian Hofer", is shown on a light-colored background.

Brian Hofer
Executive Director
(510) 303-2871
brian@secure-justice.org
<https://secure-justice.org/>
San Francisco Bay Area, CA

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: Julien DeFrance 3 letters
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 1:48:52 PM
Attachments: [Julien DeFrance 3 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 3 letters, from Julien DeFrance, regarding various subjects

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: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [DPW, \(DPW\)](#); [McCormick, Patrick \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station, \(POL\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: POLK/MYRTLE: School kids forced into traffic as homeless encampments and crackheads are blocking sidewalk
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 9:10:23 AM

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

POLK/MYRTLE: School kids forced into traffic as homeless encampments and crackheads are blocking sidewalk.

Revolting, infuriating.

This is happening every single day, multiple times a way.

So many times, young kids, elderly folks with cane or walker, women pushing strollers are forced into traffic at this very location and others in the area, and i'm sure all over town, as our sidewalks are simply obstructed by the homeless, crackheads, tents, junk, trash/filth/drug paraphernalia and much more.

Simply unacceptable.

Please prioritize street cleaning including all alley streets, and the expedited removal of these individuals whenever encountered and/or notified.

Issue citations. Make arrests.

We just can't have that.



From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SFPD Northern Station, \(POL\)](#); [DPW, \(DPW\)](#); [Chris Schulman](#); [info@lowerpolkcbd.org](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [McCormick, Patrick \(POL\)](#)
Subject: Re: URGENT - 000/100/200 FERN ST - Illegal homeless encampments, passed out crackheads, trash everywhere...
Date: Sunday, October 12, 2025 9:46:59 AM

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

Same shit show again this Sunday morning.

With broken glass all over the sidewalk of Van Ness and Sutter.

You all need to step it up! For god's sake!

> On Oct 11, 2025, at 12:46, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> Fern St all the way from Larkin St, to Franklin St.

>

> We just can't have that.

>

> Please remove immediately.

>

> Issue citations. Make arrests.

>

> Thank you.

>

> Sent from my iPhone

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [DPW. \(DPW\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff; info@lowerpolkcbd.org](#); [Chris Schulman](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: URGENT - TRASH, FILTH, BROKEN GLASS AT 12XX SUTTER ST - HAZARDOUS
Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 9:40:49 AM

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

Good morning,

This trash, feces, for some humans, all of this shattered glass has now been here for several days.

Also, just take a look at these months/years old stains/spills all over our street and sidewalks!

This just isn't acceptable.

We're all paying taxes here. Lots of them. So you all need to do a better job at ensuring our weekly street cleaning scheduled is honored by DPW in the entire Lower Polk areas, including alley streets in the vicinity of Sutter and Polk.

And on any other days, we just need our sidewalks and streets, to be at least swept. Every day. Including on weekdays.

Thank you.

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: Please approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street...
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 1:53:19 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below, from Kitti Gidofalvy, 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: Kitti Gidofalvy <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 11:04 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street...



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,

Kitti Gidofalvy
kitti.gidofalvy@gmail.com
1237 Rhode Island Street
San Francisco, California 94107

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: A short film message for the Mayor and Board of supervisors. Please view
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 11:35:00 AM
Attachments: [OPEN GHWFinal - SD 480p.mp4](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from James Scott Patterson regarding various subjects.

Sincerely,

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

From: James Patterson <centermid526837@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 5, 2025 3:06 AM
To: Joel Engardio <jengardio@gmail.com>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; tom.vacar@ktvu.com; newsdesk@kpix.com; nbckntvdesk@nbcuni.com; tips@cnn.com; BreakingNews@kron4.com; Krista.Pfefferkorn@sen.ca.gov
Subject: A short film message for the Mayor and Board of supervisors. Please view

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

This will be the first in a series of short films to address some of the concerns of D4 RECALL organizers and our new West Side Voting Block. I would suggest the first thing should be done Mr. Mayor and Board of Supervisors is to OPEN the Great Highway. You want to restore TRUST with the West side of SF- That would go a long way.

2nd-Again TRUST- Scott Wiener, Todd David, Joel Engardio and Lucas Lux need to be held accountable for the illegal implementation of Prop K. Voter fraud, voter intimidation, illegal campaign contributions from special interests groups, being censored on multiple social media platforms at the behest of both Scott Wiener and Joel Engardio.

ACCOUNTABILITY = TRUST
WITHOUT THAT YOU WILL LOOSE.

3rd- appointment of someone from the recall group to Supervisor. Again - TRUST- YOU HAVE NONE. Other than the small amount of photo ops you all use, that's not enough of the actual people who reside in each of your districts. So don't bet that we can't go down the recall road again.

4- Conclusion - Scott Wiener, Joel Engardio, Todd David and Lucas Lux all got caught with their hands in the special interests groups cookie jar. Park and recs mismanagement of Sunset Dunes Park has been a fiasco. When will you all stop lying and just say you made a mistake? Again- Accountability = TRUST- without that you all will have less support in this city. Starting with WSVB- WEST SIDE VOTING BLOCK. Don't do what Joel and Scott Wiener did- BETRAYED THEIR OWN CONSTITUENTS AND TRIED TO SILENCE THEM.

No more, no we will not bend to Tech bros, billionaires or special interest groups.

Are you listening yet? Joel didn't.

Sincerely,

James Scott Patterson

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: Public Comment: Do not support my Supervisor"s push to weaken police surveillance oversight
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 11:38:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Lea McGeever regarding various subjects.

Sincerely,

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

From: Lea McGeever <lea.mcgeeever@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 6, 2025 1:18 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment: Do not support my Supervisor's push to weaken police surveillance oversight

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

Dearest Board of Supervisors,

Here is my fitting response to my [Supervisor Matt Dorsey](#) calling [police surveillance oversight](#), "idiotic," "emblematic of the anti-government left to punish San Francisco taxpayers for what we dislike about Donald Trump" and a "public gift."

I am distracted. I am disgusted.

Distracted from following the continued depravity of local SF government.

Disgusted by local SF government when I do tune in to their conservative rhetoric, fanatical power grabs. Grabby hands demanding more power over us, more destruction of our homes, of our freedom to be our authentic selves—all with those fake smiles and pleasing even tones in their duplicitous voices.

Dismayed and dejected by the public who just doesn't care as much as they should that their representatives still are putting their ambitions for more power in this fascist as fuck system ahead of their constituents' well-being and safety.

Delirious by the repetition of my voice pointing these things out over and over for years, paying high prices for negative returns.

Delusions shattering. I falsely believed people didn't want fascism, but they do. The majority here do as long as it doesn't negatively impact them. They cheer at the homeless being swept into the bay to drown rather than be housed. They clap for [drones surveilling them at the behest of cryptobillionaires](#), all in the name of safety but really in an act of control. They find warmth in blaming people with substance use disorder for their suffering, jail or forced "recovery" for those who cannot afford better. They chastise trans folx for existing, eager to torture us into early graves or chase us to other countries. They cherish their perceived safety from ICE's brutality. "Nothing I can do" the best excuse they have. "I love ICE" the worst. They champion their physical fitness over the disabled, incapable of extending a shred of care for their survival during this continuing COVID-19 pandemic. They caress their white skin. They comply with white supremacy.

They completely do not care.

I do not know what it is about myself. I do not know why I can recognize narcissists and fascists so easily, but I can. Unfortunately they can also spot me when I really see them for who they are. One time I worked in a lab and we interviewed a candidate for a job opening we had. Everyone liked this one particular man. I was the last to interview him. Afterwards I was trying to convince everyone including my boss to not hire this man. He was evasive with his answers. He greatly exaggerated his achievements. Upon digging into his resume we discovered he did some serious lying too. My women peers were convinced but my boss, also a woman, wasn't. The candidate was a white man with a good resume who was great at sucking up to power, and so my boss hired him. Sooner or later, everyone but the male managers regretted him getting hired. He literally could not do the work required of him. He needed extra supervision. He simply could not be trusted nor relied upon. I later learned my boss spoke badly of myself with the other managers. I recognized a lying narcissist, tried to protect my team from him, and got nothing in return except punishment. This dynamic has played out multiple times in various aspects of my life, and it's the same with SF government.

When former [Mayor London Breed appointed Matt Dorsey](#) as District 6's Supervisor, I was immediately suspicious given his position as Director of Strategic Communications at SFPD. This is same type of suspicion I had about Daniel Lurie given his extremely wealthy status.

For both men I paid close attention to their words, what they said and what they *didn't* say. For both men I compared their words to their actions. I formed my public criticisms from my observations and how they were a direct contradiction to my morals, and, I thought, our shared San Franciscan values. They use their power to benefit the uber wealthy and powerful, criminalizing and denigrating the suffering poor and the suffering scapegoats of society. They cloak their fascist fantasies in terms like "drug-free sidewalks," "public safety," "family zoning" and "civic joy." Hegemony over diversity, equity and inclusion.

What kind of coincidence is it that Matt Dorsey publicly praised two of my harassers, one in a SF Chronicle article and the other on a local news show? And that his staff refused to address it via email, only offering me an off-the-record phone call? What kind of coincidence is it that the first time I was targeted by another harasser, it was because I criticized Matt Dorsey online? Or what kind of coincidence is it that in my public comment against the removal of police commissioner Max Carter-Oberstone, that I was harassed in person and online over, I called for the police to be defunded, and when GrowSF posted about Lurie's replacement police commissioner, [they emphasized that defunding the police is not the answer](#)? What kind of coincidence is it when mine was the only public comment for Carter-Oberstone that mentioned defunding the police? And that a centimillionaire behind GrowSF regularly liked and reshared disparaging posts about me? What kind of coincidences are these?

The worst part was realizing multiple politicians who I thought were in opposition to fascists like Dorsey cared more about their career, their power, than about helping me defend myself against such immense power. Who was I to ask for so much from such powerful people? That's the problem when you don't care about other people's power or status over you. I forgot that *they* care.

Still I must march on. I can't publicly tear everyone down that has hurt me or I'd be alone on an island with these dangerous fascists. So I make obscure posts to my, in the grand scheme of things, small audience. I try to focus on our common goals of fighting back. I keep pointing out when SF Gov erases trans people, or the fact that Matt Dorsey called the people who boo'd Mayor Lurie out of the Trans March ["the embarrassing fringe,"](#) scapegoating us more and encouraging others to as well. The news and political clubs/parties will never give trans people the justice and care we deserve. So who cared? I did, and that's enough for me. I care. I still care. And I fear I'll always care.

"I invite the good people to submit to authority and humbly to solicit the comforts of slavery, even if I have to present it as true freedom." --The Fall by Albert Camus

[Matt Dorsey still desires to strip Sanctuary City status from "drug dealers."](#) I use quotations because we know if we give fascists an inch, they'll take more. Any new exemptions will not stop at drug dealers.

[Anti-science Matt Dorsey was successful making abstinence-only recovery](#) San Francisco's leading goal for people with substance use disorder, regressing our progress with compassion-led and data-backed harm reduction.

[Anti-science Matt Dorsey backed San Francisco's lawsuit against EPA, a Supreme Court case, over water regulations.](#) Environmentalists disagreed with Dorsey (and Mandelman's) support for the lawsuit: *"Several speakers expressed concern that San Francisco's reputation as a liberal defender of the environment would be harmed through association with the lawsuit."* Unfortunately San Francisco won the lawsuit.

Matt Dorsey, along with the other cis white gay Supervisors Rafael Mandelman and (now recalled) Joel Engardio, stood with [Mayor London Breed during a rally against homeless people.](#) *"Mayor London Breed speaks during a rally to demand the court overturn an injunction prohibiting the city from sweeping homeless encampments."*

Matt Dorsey kicked off 2025 with [this request](#), “District 6 supervisor Matt Dorsey submitted a [letter of inquiry](#) on Friday, asking local agencies to report what’s needed to start “mass arrests” of drug users and dealers with a quota of at least 100 arrests a day.”

Matt Dorsey [wants to repeal San Francisco’s Equal Benefit Ordinance](#) at a time when gay marriage may very well be invalidated by the Supreme Court: “Gay activists went to gay then-supervisor Tom Ammiano with their idea to make companies doing business with San Francisco offer benefits to their employees in domestic partnerships if they provided those benefits to straight married couples. The thought was that domestic partners would be able to obtain health insurance and other benefits. The law, co-sponsored by lesbian then-supervisors Leslie Katz and Susan Leal, was groundbreaking.”

[Matt Dorsey tried to change the city charter](#) to “[retain] staff and [expedite] hiring for the city’s police force, his second attempt to fill vacancies in a department that some argue is short by more than 500 officers,” repeating SFPD’s theoretical, not historical, staffing level requirements...like a Director of Strategic Communications would.

These are a few examples off the top of my head of Dorsey living up to my assessment of his character and intentions as a Supervisor. I was surprised any self-professed progressive Democrat would want to work with him, be photographed with him, or sign off on his legislation. I no longer am.

As always, feel free to prove me wroooooooooong :)

Lea McGeever

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)
Subject: FW: Please Support Safer Illinois
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 11:41:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Prodan Statev regarding a proposed bike lane on Illinois Street.

Sincerely,

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

From: Prodan Statev <pstatev94@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 8:58 AM
To: sustainable.streets@sfmta.com; Liu, Jenica (PRT) <jenica.liu@sfport.com>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR) <a.john-baptiste@sfgov.org>; Sweet, Alexandra C. (MYR) <alexandra.c.sweet@sfgov.org>; Kirschbaum, Julie (MTA) <Julie.Kirschbaum@sfmta.com>; Wise, Viktoriya (MTA) <Viktoriya.A.Wise@sfmta.com>; Leung, Kimberly (MTA) <Kimberly.Leung@sfmta.com>; Daniel Lurie <daniellurie1@gmail.com>; clerk@sfcta.org; SFPort Commission Secretary <commission-secretary@sfport.com>
Cc: d10livablestreets@gmail.com; contact@safe-illinois.org; MTABoard@sfmta.com; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please Support Safer Illinois

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

Hello SFMTA, Mayor Lurie, Supervisor Walton, SFCTA, and Port Commission,

I live at 800 Indiana St with my family. Please support SFMTA scheduling and approving a **Quick-Build two-way, parking-protected bikeway on Illinois St from 16th to Marin** and sponsor a Prop L EP18 allocation for posts, daylighting, and corner concrete.

We ask to install before summer 2027 to prepare for Islais Creek bridge detours. This closes a Bay Trail and Blue Greenway gap serving Crane Cove, Pier 70, and Mission Bay.

Why now:

- **Closes a 1.1-mile gap** to connect roughly **6 miles of protected/shared waterfront bikeway**, linking India Basin, Crane Cove, Bayfront, and China Basin parks.
- **Documented danger:** 23 injury crashes on Illinois (2018–2024); heavy trucks and old rail tracks make current paint-only lanes unsafe.
- **On-plan:** SFMTA’s **Biking & Rolling Plan** and **North Star** network identified Illinois for all-ages-and-abilities connections; the Board adopted the plan in March 2025.
- **Broad support:** 30+ local businesses and groups back Safer Illinois.

Thank you,
Prodan Statev
District 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: Increase crime pushed to outer city county neighborhoodd
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 11:42:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from a member of the public regarding crime.

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: wy Y <dragonflysfo@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 1:09 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Increase crime pushed to outer city county neighborhoodd

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

Attention!

We call the Mayor and City officials to pay more attention to the city's outer neighborhood, like Ingleside and much neglected County of San Francisco!

Mayor Lurie and City officials Cannot just "Push the Problems" from Downtown to the outer neighborhoods!

We pay literally property taxes and suffer the consequences of this actions!

Ingleside Neighbors/Ocean Ave city college

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 Police Chief Hiring Recommendations
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 11:44:00 AM
Attachments: [2025.10.08 Police Chief Recs_IR advocates.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Language Access Network of San Francisco, regarding the police chief selection process.

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: Anisha Hingorani <ahingorani@caasf.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 3:10 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; SFPD, Commission (POL) <SFPD.Commission@sfgov.org>; Input-SFPC@ralphandersen.com
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; CMS, SFDPA (DPA) <sfdpa@sfgov.org>; Henderson, Paul (DPA) <paul.henderson@sfgov.org>; Azim, Yossef (MYR) <YOSSEF.AZIM.MYR@SFGOV.ORG>; Betz, Steven (MYR) <Steven.Betz.MYR@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco Police Chief Hiring Recommendations

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

To Police Commission, Mayor Lurie & his team, Board of Supervisors, and Department of Police Accountability:

Please see the attached letter, written on behalf of the Language Access Network of San Francisco (LANSF), with recommendations regarding the police chief selection process with best practices and perspectives from local community-based organizations that work closely with immigrant families and immigrant rights advocates.

We thank you in advance for your consideration of our recommendations.

Best,
Anisha

--



Anisha Hingorani
Chinese for Affirmative Action
Policy Manager
she/her | (415) 651-2563
ahingorani@caasf.org



October 8, 2025

San Francisco Police Commission

1245 3rd Street

6th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94158

Emailed to: Stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org, sfpd.commission@sfgov.org,
Input-SFPC@ralphandersen.com

Dear President Don Clay and members of the San Francisco Police Commission,

The unprecedented federal immigration enforcement actions since January 20, 2025 have terrified San Francisco's immigrant communities, who make up the backbone of our city. The Trump administration has waged a relentless war on immigrants where a significant number of San Francisco's undocumented community members have been arrested and detained by masked ICE agents during routine check-ins and interviews and regularly denying residents due process rights. These actions have undermined public safety, causing community members to fear going to work, miss school and health appointments, and not report crimes nor seek out public services that they are eligible for. Now more than ever, it is critical that our City departments ensure immigrant communities, particularly limited English proficient members, can access public safety services, and that SFPD is in full compliance with the City's language access law. Our city deserves to have a Police Chief that is deeply concerned about and prioritizes the well-being and safety of all its residents, including residents facing the unconstitutional actions of the federal government.

On behalf of the Language Access Network of San Francisco (LANSF), we urge the Commission to prioritize the following recommendations when identifying the best candidate to serve as Police Chief of the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD):

1. **Protect all San Francisco residents from harm by federal law enforcement:** The federal government has allocated an additional \$170.7 billion to expand immigrant enforcement and supercharge mass deportation efforts, with plans to detain and deport a record number of people from cities and borders across the United States. This summer, we witnessed tense and sometimes violent exchanges between ICE agents and protestors seeking to protect individuals at risk of deportation, and these

confrontations will only grow. These have resulted in assaults and arrests of protestors while SFPD officers stand by. Without a strong commitment to protect immigrant communities and peaceful protest, all communities will live in fear of public spaces where they may be stopped or questioned.

2. **Affirm and redouble efforts to train officers on San Francisco's sanctuary and other relevant laws:** SFPD have demonstrated that they are violating the city's sanctuary law, state data sharing prohibitions, and their own mutual aid policy. Reporting found that SFPD gave ICE and other law enforcement agencies access to local license plate reader data, allowing over [1.6 million illegal searches](#) in violation of sanctuary and surveillance laws, including 19 searches related to ICE between at least August 2024 and February 2025. Using city resources to aid federal immigration enforcement actions is illegal and breeds distrust of local government and officials. We must ensure the Police Chief is committed to implement and maintain the city's sanctuary protections, ending illegal data sharing practices, and training officers to comply with relevant sanctuary, surveillance, and mutual aid policies.
3. **Enact best practices-driven protocols when encountering ICE:** Our communities are shaken and outraged by brazen attempts by masked agents in plain clothes to kidnap caregivers, workers, and other long-time residents in unmarked vehicles. In order to strengthen trust between law enforcement, local institutions, and residents, the Police Chief must develop clear and consistent guidelines based on best practices for responding to calls for service related to suspected federal immigration enforcement. As outlined in Supervisor Chen's resolution ([File #250755](#)), each officer at the scene of suspected immigration enforcement action should 1) ask to speak to a lead agent or supervisor, 2) confirm the credentials of that lead agent or supervisor, and 3) capture the entire process on body-worn cameras. Officers should take steps to arrest or detain anyone determined to be impersonating a federal officer. In addition, the Police Chief should commit to additional guardrails to ensure that the sole objectives of SFPD involvement are the protection of human life and safety, particularly for community members on the scene. This includes requiring any officer receiving a mutual aid request involving a civil or criminal immigration enforcement action to get approval from the Police Chief and Mayor and notifying and providing documentation to the Mayor, Police Commission, and Board of Supervisors before and after mutual aid is provided in an immigration enforcement action.
4. **Ensure equal access to City service, prioritizing the language access needs:** Based on the [Language Access Network of San Francisco \(LAN\) 's report](#), we have found that limited English proficient (LEP) speakers have encountered additional language and cultural barriers in accessing our City's public safety services. For instance, LEP speakers experience long wait times at the police station, no interpretation provided when requested, difficulty to get in-language updates on an investigation, and other challenges for victims and their families. The incoming police Chief should prioritize the language access needs of our vulnerable LEP immigrant communities. We look

forward to see recommendations from immigrant rights groups in the DGO language access working groups, being considered and incorporated into the DGO, particularly on the annual training requirement for public-facing employees on how to interact with LEP individual and measures to ensure accountability and data collections on language access complaints and implementation.

5. **Partner and engage with local immigrant rights advocates**: Local advocates and rapid response networks that provide direct services to immigrant communities provide essential in-language and culturally competent outreach, legal support, resource referral and services. The incoming Police Chief must prioritize sharing information and coordinating with immigrant rights advocates before, during, and after suspected federal immigration efforts. The incoming Police Chief should also maintain a departmental liaison with the San Francisco Rapid Response Network to facilitate information sharing and mobilization of resources. For example, when rumors of alleged ICE activity spread, the department has an important role to play in calming community fears with facts. The connection to SFPD is critical in helping advocates understand what is federal immigration enforcement and what is not so that they can relay that information to worried community members who inevitably call the Rapid Response Hotline.

Ultimately, we strongly believe the next Police Chief must lead by taking action to defend our immigrant communities from federal enforcement threats, protect immigrant rights, and promote diversity, dignity and belonging for all residents, regardless of status.

Signed,

The Language Access Network of San Francisco (LANSF):
Chinese for Affirmative Action (CAA)
African Advocacy Network (AAN)
Arab Resources and Organizing Network (AROC)
Central American Resource Center San Francisco (CARECEN)
People Organizing to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)
Southeast Asian Development Center (SEADC)
South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)

cc:

Mayor Daniel Lurie, daniel.lurie@sfgov.org

Steven M. Betz, Assistant Chief of Public Safety for Mayor Daniel Lurie
steven.betz.myr@sfgov.org

Yossef Azim, Assistant Chief of Public Safety for Mayor Daniel Lurie
yossef.azim.myr@sfgov.org

Paul Henderson, Executive Director, San Francisco Department of Police Accountability,
sfdpa@sfgov.org, paul.henderson@sfgov.org

San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

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 63 - 3 letters
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 1:57:56 PM
Attachments: [SB 63 3 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 3 letters, from members of the public, regarding California State Senate Bill 63, SB63 (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.*

From: [Mike Kirschner](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Please VETO SB63 - send it back to the drawing board
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 1:04:24 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 Mike Kirschner

Email mgk@obnoid.com

Subject Please VETO SB63 - send it back to the drawing board

Message: Dear Governor Newsom,

Please veto SB 63. As a resident of San Francisco, I urge you to champion what San Franciscans are truly ready to support: a functional, reliable, and efficient MUNI system that puts riders first.

We all want great public transit. That means making accountability and operational reform a top priority—before asking voters to consider new, permanent funding sources like the regional sales tax increase proposed under SB 63.

Without a clear plan to restore public trust and improve basic service, this measure will fall into the same category as others that have failed at the ballot box. Voters want to say yes to transit—but only when they see results.

Please lead the way by ensuring any new funding is tied to measurable service improvements, fiscal responsibility, transparency and that the funds are reserved ONLY for MUNI transit services and nothing else. Let's fix what's broken before adding more to the bill.

Thank you for your service and for standing with San Franciscans who rely on this system every day.

Thank you,

From: [Jane E. Smalley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Please VETO SB63 - send it back to the drawing board
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 5:29:35 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 Jane E Smalley

Email janesmalley1@juno.com

Subject Please VETO SB63 - send it back to the drawing board

Message: Dear Governor Newsom,

Please veto SB 63. As a resident of San Francisco, I urge you to champion what San Franciscans are truly ready to support: a functional, reliable, and efficient MUNI system that puts riders first.

We all want great public transit. That means making accountability and operational reform a top priority—before asking voters to consider new, permanent funding sources like the regional sales tax increase proposed under SB 63.

Without a clear plan to restore public trust and improve basic service, this measure will fall into the same category as others that have failed at the ballot box. Voters want to say yes to transit—but only when they see results.

Please lead the way by ensuring any new funding is tied to measurable service improvements, fiscal responsibility, transparency and that the funds are reserved ONLY for MUNI transit services and nothing else. Let's fix what's broken before adding more to the bill.

Thank you for your service and for standing with San Franciscans who rely on this system every day.

Thank you,

From: [Stephen Martin-Pinto](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Please VETO SB63 - send it back to the drawing board
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 9:20:41 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 Stephen Martin-Pinto

Email stephen@stephenmartinpinto.com

Subject Please VETO SB63 - send it back to the drawing board

Message: Dear Governor Newsom,

Please veto SB 63. As a resident of San Francisco, I urge you to champion what San Franciscans are truly ready to support: a functional, reliable, and efficient MUNI system that puts riders first.

We all want great public transit. That means making accountability and operational reform a top priority—before asking voters to consider new, permanent funding sources like the regional sales tax increase proposed under SB 63.

Without a clear plan to restore public trust and improve basic service, this measure will fall into the same category as others that have failed at the ballot box. Voters want to say yes to transit—but only when they see results.

Please lead the way by ensuring any new funding is tied to measurable service improvements, fiscal responsibility, transparency and that the funds are reserved ONLY for MUNI transit services and nothing else. Let's fix what's broken before adding more to the bill.

Thank you for your service and for standing with San Franciscans who rely on this system every day.

Thank you,

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: KQED Response Letter to Resolution
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 1:14:00 PM
Attachments: [KQED LTR SF BOARD SUPERVISORS RE RESOLUTION.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from KQED regarding File No. 250726, Resolution No. 316-25.

File No. 250726, Resolution No. 316-25: Resolution supporting National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 51 KQED union workers and the reinvestment in local programming. (Chan, Chen, Mandelman, Walton)

Sincerely,

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

From: Peter Cavagnaro <pcavagnaro@KQED.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 12:59 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: KQED Response Letter to Resolution

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

Hi Ms. Calvillo:

My name is Peter Cavagnaro. I'm the Communications and External Affairs Director at KQED. Attached is a letter from our President and CEO Michael Isip in response to Resolution No. 316-25, titled "Supporting National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 51 KQED Union Workers and Local Programming," which was passed by the Board of Supervisors this summer. Please distribute this to each of the eleven supervisors and add this letter to the Petitions and Communications section of the next regular meeting agenda for SF Board of Supervisors.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.

Best, Peter

Peter Cavagnaro

Director, Communications and External Affairs

he/him

415.553.8451 | Office

KQED

2601 Mariposa St.

San Francisco, CA 94110

kqed.org

October 7, 2025

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

I am writing on behalf of KQED in response to Resolution No. 316-25, titled "Supporting National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 51 KQED Union Workers and Local Programming." We feel the need to respond with some important context that is missing from this resolution.

KQED has a long relationship with NABET Local 51, which represents workers in many areas of our operations, including television and radio production, membership, design, and facilities. We are currently negotiating with NABET on a new contract. Our objective is to reach a fair agreement that serves the critical information needs of the Bay Area residents and ensures the financial sustainability of our 71-year-old institution.

38.5% of KQED's current work force is represented by either NABET or SAG-AFTRA, which supports radio, digital news and podcast employees. Union representation at the station is growing. We have added approximately 40 union workers just over the past 2.5 years.

KQED is operating under fierce conditions in a hyper competitive, digitally dominant media environment. Accelerated changes in technology, changing audience behavior and a political landscape which resulted in the loss of federal funding for all of public broadcasting. Our existential challenge is how to evolve and sustain our public service.

The goal of KQED and other public media stations like ourselves is to serve and meet the local information and content needs of our communities wherever they are—all the time; for free. Over the last decade or so, technology has ushered massive shifts in audience behavior. Viewers in particular have and continue to move away from television broadcast to other platforms like streaming, social media, video, and podcasts.

The central argument of the NABET resolution is that KQED needs to reinvest in local television production. KQED does less in-house TV production today than previously, but overall we have grown our overall local programming and services by curating programming made by diverse independent producers, investing in local news and

information, educational work and events to enable civic dialogue and cultural experiences.

Simply, KQED is continually evolving to meet the needs of the communities we exist to serve.

This shift is not only an audience-first imperative, but also a business one that ensures our financial sustainability, made more challenging by the recent federal funding cuts. Earlier this summer, KQED, like many other public media companies, made large budget cuts to our operating budget to help position ourselves for a post-federally funded future. These cuts included layoffs, some programmatic changes and a one-year wage freeze for other staff. We need and expect NABET to be our partner as we navigate this new fiscal reality. Heavier investment in television production would require cuts elsewhere that would negatively impact our local service.

We know that our local focus on broadcast *and* digital platforms is succeeding in meeting our communities' needs. KQED now reaches more than 1.9M Bay Area residents on any one of its platforms every week. And we recently climbed to over 252,000 contributing members—who support us voluntarily—making us one of the largest membership organizations in the Bay Area.

We hope this context helps the Board of Supervisors gain a better understanding of our mission, platform strategy, and how we are filling your constituents' needs here in San Francisco and the larger nine-county Bay Area.

If you or any of our Supervisors have any questions about our position on this matter and local service, do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Michael J. Isip
President & CEO

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: Support for Thoughtful Leadership in District 4
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 1:20:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Carlton Fleming, regarding the appointment of a District 4 Supervisor.

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: Carlton Fleming <carlton.fleming@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 12:01 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; chayanne.chen@sfgov.org; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Subject: Support for Thoughtful Leadership in District 4

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am a District 4 resident and live on Great Highway with my wife, two children and our dog Samson. While I recognize some of the challenges presented by Sunset Dunes, my family and I are enthusiastic supporters and regular users of the park. Our youngest child learned to ride her bike there when the road was closed during the pandemic. Today, we can enjoy the beach without worrying about speeding cars or drivers running red lights, something that was all too common on Upper Great

Highway before the park's creation.

We have not been troubled by the modest increase in local traffic and deeply appreciate the city's continued efforts to enforce speed limits and improve safety on Lower Great Highway. The Taraval Station officers have been particularly responsive and helpful in addressing these concerns.

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success for our family, our neighborhood and San Francisco as a whole. It represents exactly the kind of forward-thinking, people-centered investment our city needs — one that brings communities together, supports small businesses and makes our public spaces safer and more vibrant.

I also want to acknowledge the thoughtful, responsive leadership that former Supervisor Joel Engardio brought to District 4. He and his staff consistently addressed neighborhood concerns, from homelessness and illegal dumping to fireworks to traffic safety, sideshows and reckless driving, with professionalism and compassion.

Beyond Sunset Dunes, Supervisor Engardio's leadership delivered real, measurable improvements across District 4, the kind of practical progress our neighborhood deserves to continue. His focus on quality-of-life issues made a visible difference for families, seniors and small businesses. We want a new supervisor who will build on this momentum, not reverse it.

In particular, we have seen tangible improvements in:

- **Public Safety and Traffic:** Supervisor Engardio worked closely with Taraval Station and the SFMTA to make our streets safer by installing new stop signs, radar speed displays and crosswalks on Lincoln Way, and supporting the city's first automated speed cameras, which have already reduced speeding by more than 70% at pilot locations. He also championed anti-sideshow speed bumps after dangerous stunt driving incidents in the Sunset.
- **Police Presence and Crime Reduction:** When Taraval Station lost nearly half its officers, Engardio helped bring retired SFPD officers back as neighborhood foot patrols. Property crime and burglaries that had spiked in 2022 began to stabilize by 2024, thanks to his push for targeted enforcement and stronger prosecution of repeat offenders.
- **Clean and Livable Neighborhoods:** He responded rapidly to encampments and RV issues, coordinating outreach and cleanup while protecting public spaces for residents. He also expanded street cleaning, graffiti removal and organized volunteer clean-up events that made the Sunset more welcoming.
- **Infrastructure and Family-Friendly Streets:** He championed quick-build pedestrian projects, safer intersections near schools and parks and supported funding for park maintenance and street repaving.

District 4 deserves a supervisor who will continue this balanced, responsive approach: someone who values both compassion and accountability, supports our police and public works teams and keeps listening to residents to solve problems. Selecting a Supervisor simply by a “No on K” litmus test will imperil Sunset Dunes and neighborhood safety, with no clear path for the City to turn it back into a road. We need a Supervisor who acknowledges the results of Proposition K and will work to support the neighborhood and the park, rather than simply seeking to tear it down.

As a resident of District 4, I urge you to:

- Appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will continue to support Sunset Dunes and build upon its early success; and
- Encourage leadership that listens to residents and takes concrete action to improve neighborhood quality of life.

Thank you for your leadership and your commitment to San Francisco’s future.

Best,

Carlton Fleming
District 4 Resident

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: Protect the Voice of Small Business — Preserve the Small Business Commission
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 10:40:00 AM
Attachments: [Doc1.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations regarding the Small Business Commission.

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: Tim Omi <tim@sfcdma.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 2:20 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Protect the Voice of Small Business — Preserve the Small Business Commission

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors and the Task Force on Commission Reform.
Please find the San Francisco Council of District Merchants Association position on the proposed changes to the Small Business Commission structure.

Timothy Omi
tim@sfcdma.org
1-415-590-0930
President, San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations
President, Fillmore Merchant Association



Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors and the Task Force on Commission Reform,

San Francisco's small, independently owned "mom and pop" shops are the heart and soul of our commercial corridors — they define the character, vibrancy, and diversity that make our neighborhoods so special. Behind every small business is an owner whose success depends on dedication, perseverance, and an unwavering commitment to their community.

The proposals currently under consideration that would weaken, destabilize, or remove the Small Business Commission (SBC) from the City Charter are, in our view, unacceptable. The SBC is one of the few remaining independent voices that truly represents the grit and determination of small business owners in San Francisco.

Removing the SBC from the Charter risks isolating this vital advocate for the health and vibrancy of our commercial corridors. Equally concerning is the suggestion to eliminate commission seat qualifications and its oversight authority over the Office of Small Business. These provisions exist to ensure that real small business experience informs city policy — and that leadership remains accountable to the community it serves.

While we are fortunate to have capable and dedicated leadership in the office of Small Business, there is no guarantee that will always be the case. The institutional safeguards that preserve the independence and authority of the Small Business Commission are essential to protecting the long-term interests of small businesses citywide.

If the intent of this reform is to strengthen transparency and accountability, these proposals do the opposite — they risk silencing the small business voice at a time when it is needed most.

The San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations (SFCDMA) strongly urges city leaders to:


- Keep the Small Business Commission in the City Charter
- Maintain its authority and oversight role in key decisions
- Preserve seat qualifications to ensure that commissioners have real small business experience

Sincerely,

Timothy Omi

President of The San Francisco Council of District Merchants Association

From: Cody Smith
2995 Woodside Rd Ste 400 PMB 272
Woodside, CA 94062



To: **San Francisco City Council / Board of Supervisors**
c/o Office of Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689



Subject: Suggestion to Adopt the *Glance TravelSafely* Smart Traffic System in San Francisco

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers / Supervisors,

I hope y'all are doing well. I'm writing as a resident of the Bay Area who cares about safety, traffic, and pushing this region forward. I want to suggest that San Francisco consider adopting **Glance TravelSafely**, a connected-vehicle / smart-traffic system that lets traffic signals, school-zone beacons, crosswalk sensors, and even emergency vehicles "talk" to drivers and cyclists via a simple app. It gives live, spoken alerts about red-light violations, pedestrians in crosswalks, wrong-way drivers, and emergency responders.

Now, here's what I believe makes this idea especially fitting for San Francisco:

- We're right in the center of the **San Francisco – Silicon Valley – Bay Area**, arguably the top tech hub in the world. Companies like Apple, Google, Zoom, Meta, Tesla — they're all around us. If any city is going to lead in smart transportation, it's this one.
- San Francisco streets are busy, mixed-use, full of pedestrians, cyclists, buses, and vehicles all in tight space. A system like this can help reduce collisions, alert folks before dangerous situations, and improve signal coordination.
- Even doing a small pilot — maybe along busy corridors like Market Street, Van Ness, or key intersections near transit hubs — could show noticeable benefits. If it works, the City could expand it in partnership with Caltrans, neighboring cities, and regional planning agencies.
- Embracing technology like this also shows San Francisco is serious about being at the forefront of innovation, not just in software, but in transportation, safety, and urban infrastructure.

I deeply appreciate all the work you already do to manage traffic, safety, and infrastructure in this city. I hope this idea gets a fair look from your staff or committees responsible for transportation and innovation. If you want help, research, or connections to the people behind Glance TravelSafely, I'm more than happy to assist.

Thanks for your time and for being stewards of a city that's always pushing forward.

Respectfully,

Cody Smith

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: 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, October 16, 2025 2:09:38 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from a member of the public, regarding bike lanes on Valencia 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: pcothenet@gmail.com <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, October 13, 2025 8:44 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please install curbside protected bike lanes on Valencia Street south of 23rd Street to make Valencia safer for all people, better for business, and help people shift trips from cars to walking, biking, and public transit...

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

The Board of Supervisors ,

Alongside Streets Forward, I urge you to install curbside protected bike lanes on Valencia Street south of 23rd Street before the end of 2025 to make the street safer for all people, better for business, and help people shift trips from cars to walking, biking, and public transit. Please work with Streets Forward to design and install protected bike lanes on this critical section of San Francisco's bike network.

The paint-only, unprotected bike lanes on Valencia Street south of 23rd are dangerous for all people and discourage people from shifting trips from cars to walking, biking, and public transit, which increases car traffic, demand for car parking, noise, air pollution, roadway fatalities and injuries, and climate emissions and decreases revenue for local businesses. We need curbside protected bikeways on Valencia Street south of 23rd Street now to increase safety for all people, benefit local businesses, and help people shift trips from cars to bikes, scooters, and other forms of sustainable transportation. The protected bike lanes should be curbside, have protected intersections, and not have any "mixing zones" and be installed before the end of 2025. This is an amazing opportunity for our city, and we need you to take action.

Thank you,

pcothenet@gmail.com

3747 Cesar Chavez

San Francisco, California 94110

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: Taxi Driver experiences at SFO - 3 letters
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 2:22:20 PM
Attachments: [3 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 3 letters, from a member of the public, regarding their experiences with taxis at San Francisco International Airport (SFO).

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: [Namdev Sharma](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Harassment of taxi drivers at airport
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 5:23:37 PM

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

10/08/2025 . Last Wednesday AirPort Police was inspecting taxi cabs without any notice. While every taxi cabs passed AirPort inspection at the office of GTU. It was very terrifying 50 police officers were inspecting the taxi cabs again & again. Police officers did not remember some taxi cabs were inspected before & police officers were harassing the taxi drivers to do inspections again and again. Every taxi driver logged in to the virtual taxi app at 5am. When taxi driver came to airport to pick up and fare after 7hours wait. Lots of taxi cabs were forced to leave without picking up passengers. Not only that , I asked the police officer can we come back after fixed our taxi cab to the waiting lot to do the inspection again. Police officer said taxi driver's have to go to GTU office at San Bruno. We want their GTU & waited almost 2 hours for inspection. Our taxi cabs were passed. When we entered again to the taxi waiting lot at airport. It was shocking that police officers were inspecting our taxi cabs third time . We told them we came from GTU our taxi cabs are passed . If they police officer wanted to inspect our taxi cabs third time why they sent us to GTU for inspection. Enough is enough. It is terrible how police crushed us & humiliated us at the airport. Taxi drivers woke up 5am and picked first fare at 3pm. We can not afford to waste our time . How we pay our taxi medallion loans payments. To day again we were harrassed by airport dispatcher at airport taxi waiting lot our taxi vehicles inspected again. Which person was inspecting our taxi cabs again he refused to give his & his manager's name. We told him our taxi cabs inspected thrice last Wednesday. That person was crossing his boundaries & harassed us again. His managers's name is Hilda. Supervisor's name is Shynel. We can not tolerate this humiliation. You should take action against air port police & management of airport taxi waste lot. We taxi drivers are ready to file bankruptcy. We can not afford to buy new vehicles.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Namdev Sharma](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Airport police
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 6:15:52 PM

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

Every taxi is inspected by GTU for 6 months. Last Wednesday 10/08/2025 Every taxi cab driver logged in to virtual taxi app to pick up passengers at 5am. When taxi drivers turn came after 7hours long wait . As soon as taxi drivers entered in to taxi cabs waiting lot. San Francisco airport police un expectedly were doing inspection. Airport police failed lots of taxi cabs in inspection for miner things . Failed taxi cabs were not allowed to pick up after 7 hours wait . I asked police officers can we come back to the same parking lot to do inspection . Police officers kicked lots of failed taxis out without picking up passengers for miner things. Airport police forced taxi drivers to go to GTU for inspection. GTU office was closed 11am to 1pm. When we taxi drivers went to GTU for inspection . It was 2 hours waiting time. It is ridiculous. After GTU inspection when taxi driver went to airport for pick up first taxi fare after 3pm than airport police started to do inspection again. We told police our vehicles are passed by GTU. It don't make a sense why police officers did inspection thrice . Which is unacceptable. It is harassment & humiliation . Police at airport wasted our whole day . You know taxi driver's situation is beyond out of control. Police officers behavior is not acceptable at airport. Taxi drivers can not afford to buy new vehicles. Taxi driver are ready to file bankruptcy. San Francisco city would not have taxi cabs in the future. We hope San Francisco city supervisors should tell the airport police do not harass taxi drivers at airport in the future.

Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Namdev Sharma](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Harassment to taxi drivers
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 6:30:33 PM

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

Airport taxi waiting lot management is crossing their limit. Our taxi cabs have inspected by GTU & airport Police thrice last Wednesday 10/08/2035. We have been harassed by Police last Wednesday. Today airport taxi wait lot management inspected our taxi cabs again. They have no rights to inspect taxi cabs, We consider it a threat to taxi drivers. Who was harassing taxi drivers for inspection refused to give his name & his manager's name . We told him he is not a police officer why he is doing it to us. That is unacceptable. We can not tolerate this humiliation. He said his manager told him to inspect taxi cabs . While taxi cabs inspected before. His manager's name is Hilda. We want San Francisco city Supervisor should take action against this manager and give us justice.

Thanks.

action against the manager. Because insp

Sent from my iPhone

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 \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File No. 250790 - 2 letters
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 2:29:36 PM
Attachments: [2 letters 250790.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 letters from a member of the public and the West of Twin Peaks Central Council regarding:

File No. 250790, Resolution No. 456-25 - Resolution expressing interest in forming an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) to support funding Affordable Housing in Well-Resourced Neighborhoods and requesting the Controller's Office, Office of Economic Workforce Development, and Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to explore options for establishing an EIFD and other innovative financing options.

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: [D M LaPointe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [CON, Controller \(CON\)](#); [SFhousingInfo](#); [OEWD \(ECN\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Wtpcc Delegates](#); [Wtpcc Officers](#)
Subject: WTPCC Letter on Guardrails for EIFD Implementation (File No. 250790)
Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 4:21:58 PM
Attachments: [WTPCC EIFD Guardrails final.docx](#)

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

Dear Supervisors and City Officials,

On behalf of the West of Twin Peaks Central Council, I am submitting the attached letter regarding the City's upcoming report on the recently adopted EIFD legislation (File No. 250790).

As outlined, we urge the inclusion of clear fiscal and neighborhood guardrails to ensure the EIFD framework does not divert essential General Fund revenues or destabilize long-established neighborhoods from essential services. With the City's report due in the coming weeks, we believe it is critical that these principles be reflected in the analysis.

Thank you for your attention and continued engagement on this important issue.

Warm regards,
Denise LaPointe

--

Denise M. LaPointe
President
WTPCC

9/30/25

To:

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Mayor Daniel Lurie
City Departments

Re: Protecting Our Neighborhoods from Unfair EIFD Plans (File No. 250790)

Dear City Leaders,

As San Francisco homeowners and residents, we are deeply concerned about the new resolution (File No. 250790) authored by Supervisor Melgar exploring the creation of an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) in so-called "Well-Resourced Neighborhoods."

Our neighborhoods are being unfairly singled out to carry the City's housing goals. This approach risks changing the character of stable, livable neighborhoods while taking away tax dollars that should support police, fire, schools, and infrastructure across the whole city.

We believe any future discussion of EIFDs must include **basic protections**:

- **Fairness:** Share the responsibility citywide. Don't scapegoat one set of neighborhoods.
- **Services First:** No new projects unless police, fire/EMS, sewer, transit, and parks can handle the growth.
- **No Blank Checks:** Sunset dates, audits, and off-ramps must be built in so taxpayers aren't locked in forever.
- **Protect Neighborhood Character:** Respect existing design standards, historic resources, green space, and neighborhood covenants.
- **Transparency and Voice:** Residents must be part of the process from the start, not after the fact.

Without these safeguards, this EIFD idea is unfair, destabilizing, and unacceptable to our neighborhoods.

We urge you to listen to residents, adopt these guardrails now, and work toward citywide solutions that are truly fair and sustainable.

Sincerely,

Neighborhood/Association

Twin Peaks Improvement Association

 DON CROWDER
Secretary/Treasurer

From: [Denise LaPointe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: can you send?
Date: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 11:23:16 AM
Attachments: [letter to BOS, Mayor, City Depts EIFD Plans -250790.pdf](#)

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

Please find attached a letter submitted on behalf of my neighbor. DL

Dona Crowder
Broker Associate
dona@donacrowder.com
Coldwell Banker Global Luxury
1560 Van Ness Ave 2nd floor
SF, CA 94109
DRE # 00570185
www.donacrowder.com

.

9/30/25

To:

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Mayor Daniel Lurie
City Departments

Re: Protecting Our Neighborhoods from Unfair EIFD Plans (File No. 250790)

Dear City Leaders,

As San Francisco homeowners and residents, we are deeply concerned about the new resolution (File No. 250790) authored by Supervisor Melgar exploring the creation of an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) in so-called "Well-Resourced Neighborhoods."

Our neighborhoods are being unfairly singled out to carry the City's housing goals. This approach risks changing the character of stable, livable neighborhoods while taking away tax dollars that should support police, fire, schools, and infrastructure across the whole city.

We believe any future discussion of EIFDs must include **basic protections**:

- **Fairness:** Share the responsibility citywide. Don't scapegoat one set of neighborhoods.
- **Services First:** No new projects unless police, fire/EMS, sewer, transit, and parks can handle the growth.
- **No Blank Checks:** Sunset dates, audits, and off-ramps must be built in so taxpayers aren't locked in forever.
- **Protect Neighborhood Character:** Respect existing design standards, historic resources, green space, and neighborhood covenants.
- **Transparency and Voice:** Residents must be part of the process from the start, not after the fact.

Without these safeguards, this EIFD idea is unfair, destabilizing, and unacceptable to our neighborhoods.

We urge you to listen to residents, adopt these guardrails now, and work toward citywide solutions that are truly fair and sustainable.

Sincerely,

Neighborhood/Association

Twin Peaks Improvement Association

 DON CROWDER
Secretary/Treasurer

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: Scooter Partners are Defrauding the City
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 10:48:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from a member of the public regarding scooter rental companies.

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: glitterhaus415 <glitterhaus415@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 9:05 PM
To: scootershare@sfmta.com
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Scooter Partners are Defrauding the City

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

As a low income resident and housing insecure person I depend on these programs that offer discounted rates. when I heard about these programs that provided discount services I eagerly applied and was accepted

I was surprised to learn that when I haven't logged in in a while my account is deleted and logged out. And I've never notified via e-mail or text message. What these companies are doing are purging their accounts and making us reapply to the program. it should also be noted that LIME is collecting money for a charity that no longer exists specifically Our Trans Home

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: Digital Coupon Discrimination
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:31:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Boyd Richard, regarding digital coupons.

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: Boyd Richard <boyd@hainesgallery.com>
Sent: Friday, October 10, 2025 3:23 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Digital Coupon Discrimination

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please follow the lead of the city of San Diego and address the discriminatory practice of digital coupons at Safeway. In a time when grocery prices are what they are, don't allow corporations doing business in San Francisco to treat the elderly and poor in this manner.

Thank You,

Boyd Richard

--

Boyd Richard
Registrar / Preparator
He/Him
Haines Gallery
2 Marina Blvd, Building C, First Floor
San Francisco, CA 94123
cel: 415-960-4117
www.hainesgallery.com
boyd@hainesgallery.com

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)
Subject: FW: Request for Supervisorial Hearing: Systemic Discrimination and Retaliation by SFPD
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:34:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Mark Steven Chan 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

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Steven Chan <markchanucla@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, October 10, 2025 8:21 PM
To: Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Request for Supervisorial Hearing: Systemic Discrimination and Retaliation by SFPD

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

Dear Supervisor Chan and Members of the Board,

Although I no longer reside in San Francisco, I am writing as a former resident and direct victim of police misconduct, torture, and discriminatory retaliation by members of the San Francisco Police Department. These events occurred within the City and County of San Francisco and therefore fall within your jurisdictional oversight authority.

I have already sought administrative remedies through the Department of Police Accountability and the San Francisco Human Rights Commission. Both confirmed that they lack authority to investigate police misconduct or discrimination, leaving serious civil-rights violations unaddressed.

Accordingly, I am requesting that the Board of Supervisors, through the Government Audit & Oversight Committee, convene a public hearing or joint inquiry with the Police Commission and Human Rights Commission to examine systemic failures that enable such abuses to persist.

Copies of my correspondence with the Human Rights Commission, Department of Police Accountability, and SFPD Internal Affairs, as well as my Civil Grand Jury Petition, are available upon request.

Please confirm receipt and advise which staff member may coordinate further communication.

Respectfully,

Mark Steven Chan
Juris Doctor
Mobile: (310) 869-1656

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: SF Board of Appeals approves mitigation after hearing that city departments allowed unpermitted tree removals breaking community trust in UN Plaza
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:38:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image004.emz](#)
[image005.png](#)

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Michael Nulty, regarding unpermitted tree removals at United Nations 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: Michael Nulty <sf_district6@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 12, 2025 11:32 PM
To: sfchalkboard@lists.riseup.net
Subject: SF Board of Appeals approves mitigation after hearing that city departments allowed unpermitted tree removals breaking community trust in UN Plaza

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

[Board urges remediation after unpermitted tree removals at United Nations Plaza; departments to plant replacement trees and consider mitigation](#)



**Board urges remediation after unpermitted tree removals
at United Nations...**

After hearing an appeal by Tenderloin Tree Campaign, the Board of Appeals denied the appeal but required mitigation...

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: [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 Leadership on Traffic Surveillance Privacy Protections
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:40:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Henrik Gehrmann regarding traffic surveillance systems.

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: Henrik <henrik@par7y.com>
Sent: Monday, October 13, 2025 3:33 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Request for Leadership on Traffic Surveillance Privacy Protections

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing as your constituent to commend San Francisco's leadership on surveillance oversight and to request the Board consider extending these protections to traffic surveillance systems.

San Francisco has been a national leader in protecting residents from unchecked surveillance technology through our surveillance ordinances. However, automated traffic enforcement systems (red light cameras, speed cameras, license plate readers) largely operate outside this oversight framework despite collecting vast amounts of location and movement data on San Franciscans.

I'm writing to request the Board consider:

1. **Applying surveillance oversight** to traffic enforcement technology under existing ordinances
2. **Evaluating privacy impacts** of any automated traffic enforcement proposals
3. **Leading statewide efforts** to establish privacy protections for motorists, similar to SF's facial recognition ban

Privacy concerns with traffic surveillance:

- Continuous tracking of vehicles and driver movements
- Indefinite data retention without cause
- Potential data sharing with other agencies
- Lack of transparency in how data is used or protected
- Mission creep beyond traffic enforcement

San Francisco has consistently prioritized civil liberties and privacy rights. Our city is positioned to lead California in establishing strong protections against mass traffic surveillance while still maintaining public safety.

I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this issue further and would appreciate any information about:

- Existing policies governing traffic surveillance in SF
- Upcoming relevant legislation or hearings
- How residents can engage with the Board on these concerns

Thank you for your consideration and continued leadership on privacy rights.

Respectfully,

Henrik Gehrmann
San Francisco, CA

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: Taraval Street Block Between 23rd and 24th — Ongoing Trash Can Obstruction, No Action from 311
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:42:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Ted Scott-Smith, regarding trash cans on Taraval Street.

Sincerely,

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

From: Scott-Smith, Theodore <scott-smith@sfusd.edu>
Sent: Monday, October 13, 2025 7:35 PM
To: DPW, (DPW) <dpw@sfdpw.org>; DPW-CodeEnforcement <CodeEnforcement@sfdpw.org>; DPW-Public Works Commission <publicworks.commission@sfdpw.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Mayor, MYR (MYR) <mayor@sfgov.org>; Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS) <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>; Shao, Sophie (BOS) <hshao@sfgov.org>
Subject: Taraval Street Block Between 23rd and 24th — Ongoing Trash Can Obstruction, No Action from 311

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

Hi Mayor Lurie, Public Works, and Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing about a long-standing problem on Taraval Street between 23rd and 24th Avenue. The entire block is lined with trash and recycling cans that stay out 24/7. Multiple businesses and residences leave them on the sidewalk, blocking white zones, disabled parking, and pedestrian access.

This block sits directly across from the park and stands out compared to neighboring streets — it looks neglected, with dirty, rusted cans, food waste, and strong odors when it's warm. There are families and a daycare here, and our kids walk this route every day. We have to move cans just to park.

I've already spoken directly with several of the residents and businesses and filed two 311 reports, but nothing has changed. The lack of response has made it clear that this needs attention from multiple departments.

I'm asking for a coordinated inspection and enforcement from Public Works and Code Enforcement, and oversight from the Mayor's Office and Board of Supervisors to ensure this block is brought into compliance. I can provide photos if needed.

Thank you for your time and attention to this issue.

Best,

Ted Scott-Smith

1325 Taraval Street

San Francisco, CA 94116

scott-smith@sfusd.edu

415-624-5349

Ted Scott-Smith
Special Education Teacher/Case Manager
A.P. Giannini Middle School
 [\(415\) 759-2770 \(extension 64567\)](tel:(415)759-2770)

CONFIDENTIAL STUDENT INFORMATION:

This e-mail message is for the sole use of the designated SFUSD recipient(s) with a legitimate educational interest and may contain legally confidential information protected by the Family Education Rights Privacy Act (FERPA) 20 USC 1232g. Any unauthorized review, use, distribution or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. This email cannot be produced for a records request.

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 Committee Action: Muni Policy and Public Campaign to Prohibit Cell Phone Audio
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:44:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Peter Sherman, regarding cell phone use on Muni vehicles.

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: Pete S. <shermanp147@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 10, 2025 10:50 AM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Request for Committee Action: Muni Policy and Public Campaign to Prohibit Cell Phone Audio

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

Dear Mr. Carroll,

I am a concerned Muni rider and constituent, and I am writing to the Land Use and Transportation Committee regarding a pervasive quality-of-life issue that I believe the Board of Supervisors should champion: the noise disruption caused by audio from cell phones on Muni vehicles.

The current "No Music" decals, featuring an outdated boombox, fail to address the primary source of disruption today: harsh, digitized, and unpredictable sound from short-form videos and electronic media. This noise, which rapidly shifts from music to loud speech, arguments, animal squeals, tires spinning, gunshots etc. or jarring sound effects, causes auditory fatigue and makes the daily transit experience miserable for thousands of riders.

The Case for a Clear, System-Wide Rule:

This is not a trivial complaint; it is a serious impediment to ridership.

We already see a clear industry standard for even moderate-length trips; long-distance carriers (e.g., those serving Monterey or Central California) enforce a strict "headphones only" rule for two-hour bus rides. No speakerphone conversations, no video watching without headphones etc.

Given that many Muni routes approach an hour in duration, our riders deserve the same basic standard of a respectful, quiet environment.

This issue is one of unclear policy, not malice. When I intervene, passengers almost always oblige, proving that a simple, clear rule is the solution.

I urge the Land Use and Transportation Committee to advocate for two critical changes:

- * Immediate Policy Clarity: Direct the SFMTA to replace the outdated boombox decals with new signage that clearly depicts a cell phone with a "No" symbol over the speaker, explicitly stating "Headphones Only."

- * Public Advocacy Campaign: Sponsor or advocate for a public campaign—leveraging Muni's internal advertising space—to clearly communicate this revised standard and foster a culture of respect on board.

This simple, administrative change, backed by a public campaign, is a powerful and low-cost "quick win" that would immediately boost rider satisfaction and support the city's goal of ridership recovery.

Thank you for your time and for considering the importance of this quality-of-life issue. I would appreciate any advice on how I, as a resident, can best support a public campaign to move this issue forward.

Sincerely,

Peter Sherman

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: Time Sensitive Message from San Franciscans for an Independent Women's Commission
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:46:00 AM
Attachments: [25.10.14 SF Standard Inside the gutting of San Francisco's women's rights infrastructure.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below for communication from the San Franciscans for an Independent Women's Commission, regarding the Commission on the Status of Women.

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: Emily Murase <emily@emilymurase.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 9:52 AM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; commissionstreamlining <commissionstreamlining@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; David Chiu <david.chiu@sfgov.org>; Chu, Carmen (ADM) <carmen.chu@sfgov.org>; assemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov; assemblymember.handy@assembly.ca.gov; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Caryl Ito mail <Carylito@aol.com>; Sharon Johnson <sharonpearl1942@gmail.com>; Andrea Shorter <andreashorter@yahoo.com>; Dorka Keehn mail <dorka@igc.org>; Nancy Kirshner-Rodriguez <nancykrod@gmail.com>; Kathy Johnson <kathyjoh9@gmail.com>; Melara wk mail <Communique@sbcglobal.net>; Micaela Leonarte Paredes <mleonarteparedes@dons.usfca.edu>
Subject: Time Sensitive Message from San Franciscans for an Independent Women's Commission

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

On behalf of San Franciscans for an Independent Women's Commission, I am forwarding to you a link to the *SF Standard* article by Anya Schultz that was published this morning "Inside the gutting of San Francisco's women's rights infrastructure." <https://sfstandard.com/2025/10/14/kimberly-ellis-gutting-sf-department-on-women/>. The article is also attached.

As you may know, I served as Executive Director of the Department on the Status of Women under 5 Mayors, immediately preceding Kimberly Ellis. Copied below is my public comment to the Commission Streamlining Task Force on the decision it will make on October 15 to recommend taking the Commission on the Status of Women out of the SF Charter and relegate it to an advisory (not policy) role OR to keep it as a policy body. San Franciscans for an Independent Women's Commission is further advocating for the Commission on the Status of Women to be restored as an independent Commission, and not under the Human Rights Commission.

Much appreciation for your consideration.

San Franciscans for an Independent Women's Commission

Caryl Ito, Former President, COSW

Dr. Kathryn Johnson, Writer & Gender Policy Consultant

Sharon Johnson, Former Executive Director, COSW

Dorka Keehn, Former President, COSW

Nancy Kirshner-Rodriguez, Former President, COSW

Sonia Melara, Former Executive Director, COSW

Dr. Emily Murase, Former Executive Director, COSW

Andrea Shorter, Former President, COSW

Emily

Emily M. Murase, PhD

"Nobody is free until everybody's free." - Fannie Lou Hamer, civil rights leader of the Mississippi Freedom Summer, the seminal campaign to register African American voters before the passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

On Mon, Oct 13, 2025 at 9:55 AM Emily Murase <emily@emilymurase.com> wrote:

>

> To the Streamining Commission Task Force,

>

> As you approach the October 15 meeting, I urge you to honor the will
> of the voters who supported the Commission on the Status of Women as a
> Charter Commission in 1994. The COSW is dedicated to saving women's
> lives. I served as a COSW Commissioner from 1997-2003, and as
> Executive Director from 2004-2020. During this time, the Commission
> and Department had a laser focus on ending gender violence against
> women. One of our initiatives was the Justice & Courage Domestic
> Violence Response program where, based on the 2000 Justice & Courage
> Blueprint for Domestic Violence Response, we pursued a
> cross-departmental response to ending domestic violence. In 2011, we
> became the first major municipality to eliminate domestic violence
> homicides which had been at an all time high of 10 women murdered to
> ZERO for a record 44 months, almost 4 years. I also joined other
> leaders in launching the San Francisco Collaborative Against Human
> Trafficking at City Hall in 2010, together with then-Mayor Gavin
> Newsom, then-District Attorney Kamala Harris, and then-Supervisor
> David Chiu. Today, there is a 24-hour hotline for survivors to access.

>

> Please keep the COSW as a policy (not advisory) body. There is crucial
> work to be done to ensure that San Francisco is safe for all
> residents, including its women.

>

> Emily M. Murase, PhD

>

> "Nobody is free until everybody's free." - Fannie Lou Hamer, civil
> rights leader of the Mississippi Freedom Summer, the seminal campaign
> to register African American voters before the passage of the 1965
> Voting Rights Act.



The San Francisco Standard

[Join Now](#)



Illustration by Clay Rodery

Politics

Inside the gutting of San Francisco's women's rights infrastructure

Advocates say former director Kimberly Ellis put the Department on the Status of Women on a path to failure. Now they're fighting not to lose its legacy.

Share ➞

By **Anya Schultz**

Illustrations by **Clay Rodery**

Published Oct. 14, 2025 • 6:00am

There's a common feeling among women's advocates in San Francisco these days: anxiety.

In a city that once prided itself on leading the fight against gender-based violence, infrastructure built over decades is quickly crumbling.

For over 30 years, the Department on the Status of Women was San Francisco's quiet powerhouse for domestic abuse reform and support. It's been the funder that kept shelters, hotlines, and legal aid afloat, the convener that forced reluctant agencies to coordinate, and the policy arm that turned tragedy into reform. Together with the Commission on the Status of Women, it built one of the country's most comprehensive domestic violence response systems.

Now, that system is at risk of falling apart.

Before she was ousted this year, former department head Kimberly Ellis handed off the department's \$10 million gender-based violence grant portfolio to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), an office that primarily focuses on affordable housing.

'It was a horrible four years. I personally will never be the same.'

— Beverly Upton, San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium

Following revelations that Ellis allegedly mishandled department funds, Mayor Daniel Lurie fired her and folded the Department on the Status of Women into the Human Rights Commission, effectively erasing it as an independent agency.

But the biggest repercussions from Ellis' tenure are only now being felt by the city's front-line organizations that work to keep women safe. Some have laid off staff. Others are cutting hours or covering payroll out of dwindling reserves while they wait for delayed city contracts.

The timing couldn't be worse. Federal officials are rolling back decades of progress for gender equity across the country — chipping away at reproductive rights, civil rights, and workplace equity. The “war on women” is part policy, part rhetoric: In recent months, Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth declared women shouldn't be in combat roles and President Donald Trump said domestic violence shouldn't really be considered a crime.

In 2024, the Department on the Status of Women had an annual budget of \$16.5 million. Today, it's shrunk to around \$1.4 million.

But advocates say what's disappeared isn't just money — it's decades of hard-won political power and accountability for women, at the exact moment when both are under attack nationally.



Kimberly Ellis addresses supporters following her loss for Democratic Party Chair at the California Democratic State Convention in Sacramento in 2017. | Jay L. Clendenin/LA Times/Getty Images

‘Every year, we were targeted’

San Francisco’s Commission on the Status of Women was a testament to its era, born from the second-wave feminist movement in 1975. But it was initially met with ridicule. When the proposal for a “women’s commission” first came before the Board of Supervisors, male members huddled together “making private petticoat jokes,” according to a San Francisco Examiner article published at the time.

Then-board President Dianne Feinstein pushed back. “I realize it’s difficult for a man to admit women are equal,” she said.

The commission’s starting budget was just \$55,000. But by the 1990s it had affirmed a strong mandate of reform, with the creation of a full-fledged Department on the Status

of Women. Together, they built response teams to address violence against women and

Join The Standard



By 2020, the department's grants for survivor services had grown to \$8.6 million, funding a network of shelters, legal clinics, prevention programs, and crisis lines that collectively served around 20,000 clients each year.

But growing that budget was an uphill battle — a fight that had to be won again and again at city hall.

“Every year, we were targeted for cuts,” said Dorka Keehn, who joined the commission in 1999. “But every year, we fought back.”



That legacy began to unravel with Mayor London Breed’s appointment of Ellis as department director in late 2020.

Ellis — a progressive activist who previously ran a political training program for women candidates — made her intentions clear: She had little interest in domestic violence, despite it being the central focus of the department since its inception.

“Early on she told me she was going to get rid of us,” said Beverly Upton, executive director of the San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium, the united force of the city’s gender-based violence agencies.

Instead, Ellis had her eyes on politics and events. Her priorities were women’s finances, healthcare, and political empowerment. And getting paid. Under Ellis, the department’s internal costs ballooned. Total staff compensation doubled from about \$1 million in 2020 to over \$2 million by 2023. Management salaries quadrupled during her tenure, while grantees say they didn’t receive their full funding. During the 2022 and 2023 budget cycles, the Board of Supervisors had added back \$1.2 million for the network of nonprofits. But Ellis never fully released the money.

To the shock of longtime advocates, Ellis’ vision wasn’t just talk. She sought to eliminate the department’s gender-based violence grant portfolio entirely.

It’s unusual for any director to want to move funds away from their own department, especially a grant portfolio that made up the bulk of the department’s budget.

“The only reason she gave me is she had bigger plans,” said former Commissioner Carol Ito, who met with Ellis once she learned of her plans. Ellis did not respond to requests for comment for this story.



Kimberly Ellis speaks at the California Democratic Party Convention in San Francisco in 2019. | Santiago Mejia/SF Chronicle/Getty Images

“She tried to politicize the department,” Ito said, pointing to Ellis’ penchant for fancy summits with prominent political figures. “Nobody told her you can’t do that. You’re a city department — you cannot play politics.”

Advocates, dependent on this funding for decades, said they were forced to walk a fine line, fearing retaliation if they pushed back.

Ellis’ “alignment plan” transferred the department’s grant portfolio — 39 contracts across 27 organizations — to MOHCD, an agency that had previously focused on housing, not survivor services.

In her first memo to the mayor’s office about the plan, Ellis argued that moving the grants would “reframe the narrative around gender-based violence from a ‘woman’s issue’ to a societal issue.”

Most of the gender-based violence organizations were under five-year contracts, set to sunset on June 30, 2025. Suddenly their grants changed entirely.

Under the Women's Department, competition was limited by design. Staff worked to avoid overlap and make sure the full spectrum of domestic violence services stayed funded. Under MOHCD, however, grantees were told to reapply through a competitive process that accepted over 300 applications across multiple fields. They only learned later that Ellis had given MOHCD inaccurate data about their grants and budgets, baking in reductions before the competitive process began.

Ellis told MOHCD to expect to allocate \$8.5 million in grants. According to advocates' records, the more accurate total would have been closer to \$10.5 million. MOHCD also divided the smaller pot further, with grants to new organizations.

"We're not against new agencies. It's just hard when there's no new funding," said Upton.

For many organizations, the slashed awards were devastating.

"How am I supposed to pay rent, keep lights on, help survivors, pay my staff?" Pamela Tate, director of Black Women Revolt Against Domestic Violence, asked at a five-hour Women's Commission meeting in April. Her organization's funding was cut nearly in half, from \$464,000 to \$250,000.

At the end of the marathon meeting, commissioners voted to remove Ellis as director. After a series of public revelations about her alleged misconduct and an investigation by the city attorney, Ellis was fired. Dozens of her former employees spoke out about what they described as a culture of fear and intimidation. Her lawsuit against the city over her suspension is still pending.

But the damage to the workers on the ground and the survivors they serve was done.

"It was a horrible four years," Upton said. "I personally will never be the same."

Bracing for more pain

With Ellis out and the grants gone, Lurie proposed a plan to merge the Department on the Status of Women with another scandal-plagued oversight body, the Human Rights Commission, whose former director resigned over corruption allegations late last year and is now under criminal investigation.

Women's advocates begged the mayor to reconsider the merger.

“Isolated failures of leadership must not be used as justification to dismantle the very structure that has supported, protected, and uplifted women for decades,” wrote Lucero Arias, executive director of La Casa de Las Madres in a letter to Lurie. “Women and gender justice deserve dedicated leadership, not broader bureaucracy.”

‘There’s really never been any analogous situation to what we’re experiencing right now.’

— Christopher Negri, California Partnership to End Domestic Violence

On July 1, the department was merged into a new Agency on Human Rights. The reorganization gives the human rights director ultimate authority over budget decisions, effectively placing the women's department under its control.

The city's grantees feel they've lost a focused home that knew how to knit together shelters, legal aid, and police reforms — and defend their budgets.

“This is actually the first year in many years — about 20 years — where we're getting a cut,” said Janelle White, executive director of San Francisco Women Against Rape, whose organization is receiving \$16,000 less than last year.

La Casa de las Madres — the city's oldest domestic violence shelter and recipient of the department's first check back in 1980 — is slated to have its grant cut by \$76,000, or enough to fund two staffers, according to Arias.

“We are already under staggered schedules to make sure that we have 24-hour coverage,” said Arias.

Black Women Revolt Against Domestic Violence has had to cut back on its crisis line, from 98 hours a week to 20 hours, with no service on weekends.

While the grants technically took effect on July 1, many nonprofits, even those that have signed contracts with MOHCD, have yet to access the funds.

According to Anne Stanley, communications manager at MOHCD, the entire \$8.5 million gender-based violence portfolio — plus an additional \$902,000 increase — is being distributed, but not all contracts are finalized. Until then, the agency declined to share allocated amounts. The estimated completion is in the next week or two.

The application process “was highly competitive,” Stanley said. “Unfortunately, this meant that not all eligible proposals could be funded, and some long-standing programs were further impacted by fiscal conditions in 2025.”

Advocates are hopeful that the MOHCD, which hired staffers with experience handling survivor grants, will be able to pick up the pieces.

“We’re feeling optimistic about working with the new administration,” said Upton, who added that women’s advocates have been meeting with Lurie semi-regularly since he took office.

‘There’s really never been any analogous situation to what we’re experiencing right now.’

— Christopher Negri, associate director of policy, California Partnership to End Domestic Violence

Still, the biggest toll for now, advocates say, is the stress and uncertainty about whether their programs can continue.

“There’s really never been any analogous situation to what we’re experiencing right now,” said Christopher Negri, associate director of policy at the California Partnership to End Domestic Violence.

In San Francisco and across the state, the local funding crisis is compounded by federal cuts. Most domestic or sexual violence organizations rely heavily on federal grants.

New legal requirements for federal funds have left nonprofits scrambling. Organizations are no longer allowed to mention diversity, equity, inclusion, or gender identity in their grant applications, making it nearly impossible for many of the

affected organizations in San Francisco, which have those key words in their names, to receive any funding.

Between the combined loss of city and federal dollars, Tania Estrada, executive director of the San Francisco Women's Building, has been forced to lay off eight employees.

"These decisions are going to cause ripple effects in our communities," she said. "Losing even temporary funding has lasting consequences."

The future of the Commission on the Status of Women also remains uncertain. The Prop E-mandated Commission Streamlining Task Force began meeting in January, holding hearings and collecting public feedback on which of the city's more than 130 commissions should stay and which should go.

The task force's latest memo noted the commission's legacy and its narrowed power after losing its grant portfolio, leaving it with primarily policy oversight, research duties, and a public engagement platform. The task force found no reason to eliminate the commission ahead of its review on Oct. 15, but suggested the commission could shift to an "advisory role," further limiting its power.

More than 30 letters of support have poured in to try to save the commission from what many fear will be its demise in the name of efficiency.

"Disbanding the COSW would not only signal a lack of priority for women's issues, but also reinforce the dangerous notion that women's voices and rights are dispensable," wrote Rebecca Jackson, co-chair of the SF Women's Housing Coalition. "This is something we cannot accept."

Anya Schultz can be reached at aschultz@sfstandard.com

Filed Under

Daniel Lurie Department On The Status Of Women Domestic Violence Kimberly Ellis News Politics

Read More

Newsom vetoes AI child protection bill amid tech industry opposition



Transit sales tax proposal advances toward 2026 Bay Area ballot



Newsom signs major housing bill allowing for dense construction near transit




As Lurie weighs Sunset appointment, history offers guidance: Pick a woman



Nonprofit tied to City Hall scandal eligible again for city funds; exec director to leave




Popular Right Now



1 Before publicly turning on San Francisco, Marc Benioff had privately left it behind

2 The case



About Us

Staff

Standards & Ethics

Newsletters

RSS Feeds

Jobs

Contact Us

Tips

Advertising Inquiries

Sign In

Membership

Membership FAQs

© The San Francisco Standard. All Rights Reserved.

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [California Resident Rights](#) | [Privacy Center](#) 

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: Advisory Bodies to Disability and Aging Services Deptment
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:50:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Michael Nulty, regarding the Disability and Aging Services Commission, and the Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Council.

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: Michael Nulty <sf_district6@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 10:48 AM
To: commissionstreamlining <commissionstreamlining@sfgov.org>
Subject: Advisory Bodies to Disability and Aging Services Deptment

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

- Keep the Disability and Aging Commission in its current role as Governing Body, whose seven members will continue to be appointed by the Mayor. As such, its primary role is to approve contracts and policies of the Department of Disability and Aging Services.

- Keep the Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Council in its current role as an advisory body with 11 potential members related to the implementation of the Dignity Fund ordinance.

Both the senior and disabled populations in San Francisco are growing past 25 percent and not shrinking therefore equal representation in all matters of policy and governance is needed.

The Alliance for a Better District 6 membership strogly urges the Streamling Commission to keep both the Disability and Aging Commission and the Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Council seperate San Francisco Commissions and Advisory Boards that need ongoing support

from our elected leaders and the current structure of the Advisory groups promotes good communication across the bodies and allows the space for them to engage service providers and participants through site visits and the support for the Service Provider Work Group.

Michael Nulty
Executive Director
Alliance for a Better District 6
Serving San Francisco since 1999

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: [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: Proposal for Pilot Wellness Program to Support City Employees
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:54:00 AM
Attachments: [Executive Brief.pdf](#)
[Proposal.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Young Palmer, regarding employee wellness.

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: Young Palmer <youngpalmer@pacificwest.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 1:20 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Proposal for Pilot Wellness Program to Support City Employees

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

Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors, and Clerk of the Board,

I am writing to respectfully request consideration of a new wellness initiative that could reduce costs and improve resilience among our city's employees, particularly first responders.

Attached you will find a one-page executive brief and a full proposal outlining:
The rising costs cities face from injury claims, overtime backfill, and workers' compensation among firefighters.

A new, drug-free technology (X39) designed to support natural repair and recovery.
A suggested 30-day pilot program with a small volunteer group to gather local data before considering broader adoption.

I would like to respectfully request that one or more Board Members consider sponsoring this as an agenda item for the January 6th meeting so the Board can review and discuss it.

This initiative represents a low-risk, high-potential opportunity for our city to lead the way in employee wellness and fiscal responsibility.

For your convenience, I've included background research and supporting materials here:
linktr.ee/citypresentation.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I welcome the opportunity to answer questions or provide additional information.

Respectfully,
Young Palmer
(415) 902-7696
youngpalmer@pacificwest.com

Attachments:

Executive Brief "*Reducing Costs & Improving Wellness Among City Employees*"

Full Proposal

Executive Brief

Reducing Costs & Improving Wellness Among City Employees *A Low-Risk Pilot Program Using New Wellness Technology*

The Challenge

- Firefighters: 70% experience musculoskeletal injuries during their career (NFPA).
- Worker Compensation: Firefighter claims average \$8,000–\$12,000 each (NCCI / League of Cities).
- Overtime Costs: Backfilling one injured first responder can cost the city \$20,000+ annually. These costs strain city budgets and reduce workforce effectiveness.

The Opportunity

A new, drug-free technology (X39) has shown promise in supporting the body's natural repair processes, improving recovery, sleep, and resilience.

Pilot Program Proposal

- Provide 30 patches to 30 volunteer first responders.
- Volunteers use the patch for 30 days.
- Volunteers track observations (sleep, pain, recovery, energy).
- Results presented back to Board for review.

Why Now?

- Low Risk, High Reward: Simple, non-invasive test at minimal cost.
- First-Mover Advantage: Cities worldwide will adopt wellness technologies. Early adoption positions this city as a leader.
- Term Benefit: The longer employees use it, the greater the potential impact.

Next Step

We respectfully request that this proposal be placed on the January 6th Board agenda for discussion and approval of a no-cost pilot program.

Contact: Young Palmer (415) 902-7696 youngpalmer@pacificwest.com

Proposal for Reducing Costs & Improving Wellness Among City Employees

A Low-Risk Pilot Program Using New Wellness Technology

Prepared by: Young Palmer

Contact: (415) 902-7696 youngpalmer@pacificwest.com

Executive Summary

Cities everywhere face a growing challenge: the rising costs of employee injuries, workers' compensation claims, and lost productivity, especially among first responders. Firefighters deal with high stress, physical strain, and long recovery times that burden both individual and city budgets.

A new wellness technology, the X39 patch, has shown promise in supporting the body's natural repair processes, improving recovery, and enhancing resilience. The patch is non-invasive, drug-free, and simple to use.

We propose a 30-day pilot program where city volunteers try the patch and provide feedback. This low-cost test could pave the way for measurable savings and improved wellness for city employees.

The Problem in Numbers

- Firefighters: 70% experience musculoskeletal injuries during their career (NFPA).
- Worker compensation costs: Firefighter claims average \$8,000–\$12,000 each (NCCI / League of Cities).
- Overtime replacement: Each injured first responder can cost the city \$20,000+ annually in backfill overtime.
- Stress-related costs: Nationally, stress-related absenteeism costs U.S. employers \$300 billion annually (APA).

For a city of even modest size, these numbers quickly add up to millions in hidden costs each year.

The Proposed Solution

The X39 patch is a new regenerative wellness technology designed to support the body's natural healing and repair processes. Research indicates it may:

- Accelerate recovery from injuries
- Improve sleep and resilience
- Support pain reduction and mobility
- Help maintain peak performance for demanding professions

Pilot Program Structure:

- The city uses 900 patches for trial use.
- Thirty volunteer first responders (preferably around age 40) use the patch daily for 30 days.
- Volunteers track changes in energy, recovery, sleep, and overall wellness.
- A short results summary is presented back to the Board.

This approach gives the city real-world, local data before making larger decisions.

Why Act Now?

- First-mover advantage: Fire departments worldwide will adopt wellness technology to reduce costs and improve performance. Acting early positions this city as a leader.
- Compounding benefits: The longer employees use the patch, the greater the potential cumulative benefits, which can mean long-term savings.
- Low risk, high reward: A 30-day pilot is cost-effective, non-invasive, and requires no policy change.

Call to Action

We respectfully request that the Board:

- 1 Add this proposal as an agenda item for the January 6th meeting.
- 2 Approve a low-cost, 30-day pilot program with volunteers.
- 3 Review results and determine next steps based on feedback.

This small step could lead to healthier employees, fewer claims, and meaningful savings for the

city.

Contact:

Young Palmer

(415) 902-7696 youngpalmer@pacificwest.com

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)
Subject: FW: Letter in support of File #250808
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:58:00 AM
Attachments: [CUA re Legacy business.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Henry Karnilowicz , regarding File No. 250808.

File No. 250808: Ordinance amending the Planning Code to require conditional use authorization prior to replacing a Legacy Business with a new non-residential use in certain Neighborhood Commercial, Named Neighborhood Commercial, and Neighborhood Commercial Transit Districts, and in the Chinatown Mixed Use Districts; 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 adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302. (Chan)

Sincerely,

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

From: Henry Karnilowicz <occexp@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 8:04 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter in support of File #250808

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Please distribute the attached letter with the mayor and supervisors.

Cordially,

Henry Karnilowicz

OCCIDENTAL EXPRESS

Consulting Design Construction Management

CSL #319153

1019 Howard Street

San Francisco, CA 94103-2806

415.420.8113 cell

415.621.7583 fax

https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/____www.occidentalexpress.net____.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo2MDEyYjVhZDI5YmE1YWZhYzdhZTQ5ZmM4NmJiYWJkZjo3OjBhMjc6Y2E5MTE0MDRmMjhmNjZiMjdiODBiMWE1YWQ2YzlwYmRmNzgyMzM1YjA0MmMyYWZjNmRjOGQyMTViOTM0NzllZTp0OIQ6Tg

President

SOMBA (South Of Market Business Association)

President Emeritus

San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations

Co-chair

SFPD x Chief's Small Business Advisory Forum

HENRY KARNILOWICZ

President Emeritus
San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations

October 14, 2025

Honorable Supervisor Connie Chan
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Re: File No. 250808

Dear Supervisor Chan,

I'm writing to express my strong support for your proposed ordinance that requires conditional use authorization before a Legacy Business can be replaced with a new non-residential use in certain Neighborhood Commercial, Named Neighborhood Commercial, and Neighborhood Commercial Transit Districts, as well as in the Chinatown Mixed Use Districts.

Legacy Businesses are the heart and soul of San Francisco's neighborhoods. They carry our city's history, culture, and community spirit, creating the character and sense of place that make each neighborhood special. Designating and protecting these businesses helps keep our local corridors vibrant and economically stable, while honoring the people and traditions that built them.

With recent changes in state law that make it easier to redevelop properties and bypass local planning review, many small and long-standing neighborhood businesses face growing pressure and uncertainty. Without stronger protections, we risk losing the very establishments that give San Francisco its unique identity.

Small businesses truly are the backbone of our communities. We must do everything we can to protect, preserve, and promote them, especially our Legacy Businesses that have served generations of residents and continue to hold our neighborhoods together.

Thank you, Supervisor Chan, for standing up for small businesses and for taking this important step to safeguard San Francisco's Legacy Businesses.

Sincerely,



Henry Karnilowicz

Cc
Angela Calvillo – Clerk of the Board

"Think big, Shop Small"

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: Formal Complaint Regarding Disparate Access to IHSS Orientation for English-Speaking Applicants
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:52:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Latrice McNealy, regarding the In-Home Supportive Services provider orientation process.

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: latrice mcnealy <latricemcnealy@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 11:36 AM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Cc: Press Office, Mayor (MYR) <mayorspressooffice@sfgov.org>; MYR-Appointments <mayor.appointments@sfgov.org>; commendations (MYR) <commendations@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Formal Complaint Regarding Disparate Access to IHSS Orientation for English-Speaking Applicants

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 submitting this correspondence as a formal complaint and request for immediate review regarding inequitable access to the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) provider

orientation process in San Francisco.

I am a San Francisco resident and a native English speaker currently completing the provider enrollment process. Upon contacting the IHSS Public Authority to schedule the mandatory two-hour orientation, I was informed that no English-language orientations are available until November, while orientations in Spanish, Chinese, and Russian are available within the next few days.

This scheduling disparity constitutes a disparate impact against English-speaking applicants and raises serious concerns under both Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and California Government Code §11135, which prohibit discrimination in state- or federally-funded programs on the basis of language or national origin. Although linguistic accommodation for non-English speakers is required and commendable, conversely, native English speakers should also receive translation services so they can attend non-English orientations as to not experience delay in services. The exclusionary delay for English-language orientations effectively penalizes native English speakers by restricting timely access to employment under a publicly funded program.

Specific Concerns

1. Inequitable Access: English-speaking applicants are being denied the same timely access to mandatory orientations as other language groups, resulting in financial and employment delays.
2. Disparate Treatment: Offering expedited orientation dates exclusively for certain language groups may constitute a violation of equal access requirements under federal and state law.
3. Administrative Burden: Such delays create unnecessary hardship for individuals attempting to serve the elderly and disabled populations that IHSS exists to support.

Requested Actions

I respectfully request the following actions:

An immediate audit of IHSS orientation scheduling practices to ensure compliance with equity and nondiscrimination mandates.

A written explanation for the scheduling disparity between English-language and non-English-language orientations.

A corrective action plan to ensure equal access to all applicants regardless of primary language. Which includes English translation services for native speakers during non-English orientations.

A timeline for remediation and assurance that this issue will be addressed at the administrative level, with oversight from the Mayor's Office and the Human Rights Commission.

Conclusion

As a long-term San Francisco resident and healthcare professional dedicated to serving my community, I find this matter deeply concerning. Equal access to publicly funded employment opportunities must be upheld for all applicants, without delay or preference based on language.

Please confirm receipt of this complaint and advise me of the next procedural steps for review and resolution.

Sincerely,

Latrice McNealy AAS, NMT, CMT

Medical Fofo / Neuromuscular therapist/ Medical massage clinician

415 286 6060