

FILE NO. 250474

Petitions and Communications received from May 1, 2025, through May 8, 2025, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on May 13, 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 (Re)Nominations to the following bodies. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

- Nomination pursuant to Charter, Section 4.106, to the Board of Appeals:
 - Rebecca Saroyan - term ending July 1, 2028
- (Re)Nominations pursuant to Charter, Section 4.135, to the Historic Preservation Commission:
 - Chris Foley - term ending December 31, 2028 (Renomination)
 - Diane Miyeko Matsuda - term ending December 31, 2028 (Renomination)
 - Gayle Tsern Strang - term ending December 31, 2028 (Nomination)
 - Tara Sullivan - term ending December 31, 2028 (Nomination)

The Mayor has sole appointing authority for the following bodies, and provided courtesy notice to the Board:

- Appointment pursuant to Charter, Section 8B.123(b), Administrative Code Chapter 5, Article XV, Sections 5.140-5.142, to the Public Utilities Commission Citizens' Advisory Committee:
 - Thomas Smegal - term ending May 8, 2026

From the Office of the Mayor (MYR), submitting a letter regarding the Resolution retroactively authorizing the Fleet Management Division to accept and expend an in-kind gift of a zero-emission passenger vehicle Rivian R1S from Daniel Lurie, retrofitted with appropriate security upgrades, with an estimated market value of \$134,106 for use of official City business effective March 18, 2025. File No. 250320; Resolution No. 195-25. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Department of Public Health (DPH), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.170-1(H), submitting two grant line-item budget revisions for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Department of Public Health (DPH), pursuant to the 2008 Treatment on Demand Act, Prop T, submitting Treatment on Demand Annual Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-2024. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

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

From Magick Altman, regarding various subjects. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding public transit. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From a member of the public, regarding the food service industry. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed housing project at 1979 Mission Street. 6 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From a member of the public, regarding the San Francisco Police Chief William Scott's resignation. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From members of the public, regarding public pickleball and tennis court reservation fees. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From a member of the public, regarding various subjects. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From Greg OConnor, 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. (13)

From Elizabeth Clark, regarding the Ordinance amending the Planning Code to require notice of rezoning intended to comply with Housing Element law; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare pursuant to Planning Code, Section 302. File No. 241210; Ordinance No. 64-25. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From Kenneth Camp, regarding the Charter Amendment (Third Draft) to amend the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco to define "Full-Duty Sworn Officers" for purposes of establishing minimum staffing levels for sworn officers of the Police Department; and, contingent upon the Controller's certification that a future tax measure passed by the voters will generate sufficient additional revenue to fund the cost of employing Full-Duty Sworn Officers at specified minimum staffing levels and the minimum amount necessary to implement a police staffing fund: 1) set the Minimum Staffing Number for five fiscal years beginning with 1,700 full-duty sworn officers in year one, with increases each year such that by the fifth fiscal year, the Minimum Staffing Number shall be 2,074; 2) require for a period of five years that the Mayor and Board of Supervisors appropriate funds to pay for at least the number of sworn officers as of

February 1 of the prior fiscal year; 3) establish a Police Full Staffing Fund (“Fund”) for a period of five fiscal years to facilitate minimum police staffing; 4) require that \$16.8 million be appropriated into the Fund in the first year, and varying amounts in years two through five, calculated based on staffing shortages, but allowing for a temporary freeze of appropriations to the Fund after the first year in a budgetary or economic emergency; at an election to be held on March 5, 2024. Measure B. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Kyung Choi, regarding the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Biking and Rolling Plan. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From Michael Dorf, regarding the San Francisco Municipal Transit Agency (SFMTA) Oak Street Quick-Build Project. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From Christopher Mika, regarding the proposed Resolution supporting California State Assembly Bill No. 255, introduced by Assembly Member Matt Haney, The Supportive-Recovery Residence Program, to enable state investment and establish a certification process for such programs. File No. 250466. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From Imelda Rangel, regarding the proposed Motion approving the Mayor’s nomination for the appointment of Dan Calamuci to the Building Inspection Commission, for terms ending July 1, 2027. File No. 250442. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From Francine Lofrano, regarding the proposed Resolution approving Amendment No. 2 to the agreement between the City, acting by and through, the Department of Public Health (DPH), and HealthRight 360, to provide substance abuse and mental health services, to extend the term by three years from June 30, 2025, for a new term of July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2028, and to increase the amount by \$141,427,165 for a new total not to exceed amount of \$305,358,044; and to authorize DPH to enter into amendments or modifications to the agreement that do not materially increase the obligations or liabilities to the City and are necessary to effectuate the purposes of the agreement or this Resolution. File No. 250339. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the long-term remission of substance use disorders for individuals as the primary goal of the City’s substance use disorder treatment policy. File No. 250190. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From members of the public, regarding the Hearing to assess staffing levels and needs within the District Attorney’s Office, including an evaluation of the department’s capacity to expand in coordination with other public safety agencies, the resources necessary for full implementation of Proposition 36 as well any other resource gaps, challenges related to recruitment and retention, recommending any legislative or budgetary actions to support these efforts; and requesting the District Attorney’s Office to report. File No. 250131. 25 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From Julien DeFrance, regarding various subjects. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From Katherine Alba, regarding John F. Kennedy Drive. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From a member of the public, regarding the Motion affirming the determination by the Planning Department that the proposed Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) Mid-Valencia Curbside Protected Bikeway project is statutorily exempt from environmental review. File No. 241193; Motion No. M25-004. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From Doug McKirahan, regarding California State Senate Bill 63 (Wiener, Arreguín), relating to transportation funding. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From members of the public, regarding the Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the E-Bike Incentive Fund to support implementation of an electric bicycle (or “e-bike”) incentive program administered by the Department of the Environment. File No. 240967; Ordinance No. 268-24. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From members of the public, regarding the Hearing to consider objections to a report of assessment costs submitted by the Director of Public Works for inspection and/or abatement of blighted conditions ordered to be performed by said Director pursuant to Chapter 80 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, the costs thereof having been paid for out of a blight abatement fund; scheduled pursuant to Motion No. M25-042 (File No. 250309), approved on April 15, 2025; and the proposed Resolution approving report of assessment costs submitted by the Director of Public Works for inspection and/or repair of blighted properties ordered to be performed by said Director pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 80, the costs thereof having been paid for out of a blight abatement fund. File Nos. 250310 and 250311. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From members of the public, regarding Mayor Daniel Lurie’s family housing zoning plan. 6 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From members of the public, regarding the upcoming budget of the City and County of San Francisco. 32 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (30)

From members of the public, regarding homeless service facilities in the Bayview District. 33 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (31)

From members of the public, regarding organizations that receive grants from the City. 83 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (32)

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: May 5, 2025

To: Members, Board of Supervisors

From: *AC* Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Mayoral (Re)nominations - Board of Appeals and Historic Preservation Commission

On May 5, 2025, the Office of the Mayor submitted the following complete (re)nomination packages. Pursuant to Charter, Sections 4.106 and 4.135, these (re)nominations shall be subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors at a public hearing and vote within 60 days.

Nomination to the Board of Appeals pursuant to Charter, Section 4.106:

- **Rebecca Saroyan** - Seat 5 - term ending July 1, 2028

The 60-day deadline for the above appointment expires on July 1, 2025.

(Re)Nominations to the Historic Preservation Commission pursuant to Charter, Section 4.135:

- **Chris Foley** - Seat 5 - term ending December 31, 2028 (Renomination)
- **Diane Miyeko Matsuda** - Seat 7 - December 31, 2028 (Renomination)
- **Gayle Tsern Strang** - Seat 1 - December 31, 2028 (Nomination)
- **Tara Sullivan** - Seat 3 - December 31, 2028 (Nomination)

The 60-day deadline for the above appointment expires on July 4, 2025.

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

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

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

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

Notice of Nomination

May 2, 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 §4.106 of the City and County of San Francisco, I hereby nominate Rebecca Saroyan to the Board of Appeal, Seat 5, succeeding Rick Swig, for the remainder of the unexpired term ending July 1, 2028.

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

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Lurie".

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco



Notice of Nomination

May 2, 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 §4.135, of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following nominations and renominations to the Historic Preservation Commission.

Renomination: Chris Foley (seat 5) and Diane Matsuda (seat 7) for the unfinished portion of a four-year term ending December 31, 2028.

Nomination: Gayle Tsern Strang (seat 1 formerly held by Ruchira Nageswaran) and Tara Sullivan (seat 3 formerly held by Jason Wright) for the unfinished portion of a four-year term ending December 31, 2028.

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

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Lurie".

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco



Notice of Appointment

May 2, 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 § 8B.123(b), Administrative Code Chapter 5, Article XV, §§ 5.140-5.142, of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following appointment:

Thomas Smegal to the Public Utilities Commission Citizens' Advisory Committee, succeeding Nicole Sandkulla (term expired on 5/8/2026) to serve the unexpired portion of a four-year term ending May 8, 2028.

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

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Lurie".

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [RUSSI, BRAD \(CAT\)](#)
Subject: Letter from the Mayor regarding File No. 250320
Date: Friday, May 2, 2025 1:56:00 PM
Attachments: [0375_001.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached letter from Mayor Lurie regarding File No. 250320.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-7703 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org www.sfbos.org

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

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

May 2, 2025

Dear Clerk Calvillo,

As discussed in Board File No. 250320, I am donating a vehicle to the City and County of San Francisco. I am making the donation in my personal capacity and may claim the gift as a charitable contribution. As the Board of Supervisors has voted to approve the resolution, I am prepared to exercise my Charter duty with respect to signing the resolution, under Cal. Code Regs. Title 2, section 18705, and *Affordable Housing Alliance v Feinstein* (1986) 179 Cal.App.3d 484.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Lurie".

Daniel Lurie
Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

CC: Adam Thongsavat, Mayor's Liaison to the Board of Supervisors
Manu Pradhan, Deputy City Attorney
Brad Russi, Deputy City Attorney
Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy Director, Board of Supervisors

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Grant Budget Revision - Grant name: Public Health Emergency Preparedness Program
Date: Friday, May 2, 2025 4:49:22 PM
Attachments: [2. PD69 approved budget.pdf](#)
[3. HCPD69-25 extension approved BR 4.24.25.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached from the Department of Public Health, submitting a grant line item budget revision to the Public Health Emergency Preparedness (PHEP) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2025, in accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.170-1(H).

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: Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>
Sent: Friday, May 2, 2025 2:05 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Quinonez, Miguel (DPH) <miguel.quinonez@sfdph.org>
Subject: Grant Budget Revision - Grant name: Public Health Emergency Preparedness Program

Hello,

In accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.170-1(H), this memo serves to notify the Board

of Supervisors of a (type Federal or State) grant line item budget revision in excess of 15% requiring funding agency approval.

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

Attachment: Budget revision documentation

Thank you,

Sharon Z.
Fiscal Unit - Grants
San Francisco Dept. of Public Health
1380 Howard St.
San Francisco, CA 94103

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

Public Health Emergency Preparedness - PHEP FY 24-25

Spend Plan Summary

Summary	
Organization	SAN FRANCISCO
Grant program	Public Health Emergency Preparedness
Grant period	July 1, 2024 - June 30, 2025
Total allocation	\$515,199.00
Indirect cost basis	Direct
Indirect cost rate	5.3%
Status	Approved

Invoices Summary	
Category	Total
Personnel	\$0.00
Personnel Fringe	\$0.00
Operating Expenses	\$0.00
In-State Travel	\$0.00
Out-of-State Travel	\$0.00
Equipment	\$0.00
Subcontracts	\$0.00
Other Expenses	\$0.00

Total Direct	\$0.00
Total Indirect	\$0.00
Total Advanced Payments	\$0.00
Total Invoices	\$0.00

Budget Summary	
Category	Total
Personnel	\$252,738.34
Personnel Fringe	\$100,664.74
Operating Expenses	\$18,487.26
In-State Travel	\$3,167.86
Out-of-State Travel	\$4,582.00
Equipment	\$0.00
Subcontracts	\$103,660.04
Other Expenses	\$6,200.00
Total Direct	\$489,500.24
Total Indirect	\$25,698.76
Total Budgeted	\$515,199.00

Budget items - Personnel												
Name	Time (months)	Position	FTE	Salary	Salary cost	Fringe percentage	Fringe	Fringe cost	Total cost	Total annual cost	Position filled	Budget justification
Gabby Aldern/TBD	12.0	PHEP Coordinator/Pan Flu Coordinator	65.56%	\$113,413.00	\$74,353.56	33.0%	\$37,426.29	\$24,536.68	\$98,890.24	\$98,890.24	True	Planning Coordinator responsible for liaising between various DPH Sections & programs, updating EOP & Annex plans, updating DPH DOC org & trainings, coordinating with city partners, oversees PHEP and Pan Flu grant activities. Projects will include public health emergency plan writing, training, exercise planning, and capability assessments.
TBD	4.0	Healthcare Preparedness Coordinator	100.0%	\$129,106.00	\$43,035.33	45.0%	\$58,097.67	\$19,365.89	\$62,401.22	\$187,203.67	False	Healthcare Preparedness Coordinator works collaboratively with jurisdictional partners and stakeholder and healthcare entities in development of medical system surge planning and capability building. Projects will include public health emergency plan writing, training, exercise planning, and capability assessments.
Alice Wong	12.0	Community Planning Coordinator	47.0%	\$121,238.00	\$56,981.86	45.0%	\$54,557.10	\$25,641.84	\$82,623.70	\$82,623.70	True	Responsible for engaging a variety of community sectors to enhance community resiliency and ensure that needs of at-risk populations are included in emergency planning and exercises. Participate

												in Mass Care & Shelter Work Group meetings to support public health medical mission in general population shelters.
Hoian (Sharon) Sun	12.0	Senior Clerk	80.0%	\$79,924.80	\$63,939.84	39.91%	\$31,897.99	\$25,518.39	\$89,458.23	\$89,458.23	True	Provide administrative and clerical support in processing and tracking expenditures for preparedness and response activities, including support for hiring. Duties cover all Functions and Capabilities within the grant. This position is not covered by indirect costs.
Elena Chan	6.525	Public Service Aide	40.0%	\$54,497.00	\$11,853.10	40.0%	\$21,798.80	\$4,741.24	\$16,594.34	\$30,518.32	True	Public Service Aide to provide assistance to PHEP Coordinator to support activates to coordinate implementation of corrective action programs, collect and synthesize data from exercises and trainings, and develop Branch annual reports.
Transfer funds to San Mateo for ABAHO-PHP Coordinator	0.0		0.0%	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.0%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	True	\$12,770 is deducted from our Allocation on the Summary page of budget to allow for transfer of this amount to San Mateo County to pay for Association of Bay Area Health Officials-Public Health Preparedness (ABAHO-PHP) Coordinator position. ABAHO-PHP health departments meet monthly to accomplish disaster planning of benefit to all counties. Each LHD is contributing a share of cost for this position.

DeJanelle Bovell	3.0	Healthcare Responder Coordinator	10.0%	\$102,986.00	\$2,574.65	33.43%	\$34,428.22	\$860.71	\$3,435.36	\$13,741.42	True	Healthcare Responder Coordinator's primary responsibilities are to coordinate and oversee PHEP Capability 15 Volunteer Management. DeJanelle's work includes but is not limited to ensuring the ability to coordinate with emergency management and partner agencies to identify, recruit, register, verify, train, and engage volunteers to support the San Francisco Department of Public Health's preparedness, response, and recovery activities during pre-deployment, deployment, and post deployment. This work also extends to coordinating policy and protocol for Disaster Service Workers (DSWs), Medical Response Corps (MRC) and other Disaster Healthcare Volunteers (DHVs).
------------------	-----	----------------------------------	-------	--------------	------------	--------	-------------	----------	------------	-------------	------	--

Budget items - Operating Expenses		
Name	Cost	Budget justification
Smartphone usage charge	\$1,480.00	Monthly usage fees for two smartphones for PHEPR's management team to use during surge/emergency situation.
Office and Operating Supplies	\$11,637.26	Office and operating supplies to include computers, laptops, printer/plotter, radio batteries, file cabinets, printers, pens, pencil, paper, notepads, clips, folders, binder, staples, post-it notes, toner cartridges, etc. for PHEP funded staff.
Portable wifi	\$1,370.00	Monthly usage fees for 3 portable wifi devices for ability to effectively respond to any public health emergency. Response needs to occur quickly and efficiently in order to be effective and address public concerns/fears. This depends on having response material available, including CDC, NACCHO, ASPR, CDPH and local internet resources on an immediate basis.

Survey Monkey	\$500.00	Annual fees for Survey Monkey. Access to the Survey Monkey tool will allow DPH to better facilitate the collection of information from key stakeholders to include but not limited to healthcare facilities, DPH staff, Point-of-Dispensing (POD) sites, community-based organizations, etc. The information collected from the Survey Monkey tool will help inform preparedness planning efforts through identification of gaps, priority projects, and lessons learned derived from stakeholder input.
Answering service	\$3,500.00	An answering service to receive and direct callers during off hours (nights, weekends, holidays) for emergencies which require DPH DOC staff response. Cost includes callout/paging charges.

Budget items - In-State Travel

Name	Cost	Budget justification
Various in-state travels	\$2,767.86	This is for PHEPR staff to attend various in-state travels for meetings, trainings, and events which are fulfilling all Functions and Capabilities within the grant. Travel for all funded staff will comply with Cal-HR guidelines.
EPTW Conference	\$400.00	3-days emergency preparedness training workshop which provides a forum for personnel from PHEP in California to learn and share best practices from statewide partners. Cost includes hotel, parking, and food. Number of people: one.

Budget items - Out-of-State Travel

Name	Cost	Budget justification
HELP Course Summer 2024	\$2,382.00	<p>HELP Course which provides intensive training in the public health principles of disaster preparedness and disaster management. The course was founded to apply public health principles to the humanitarian needs of populations affected by disasters, both natural and conflict-related, Cost includes return flight, hotel and food. Number of people: one Additional Justification for Johns Hopkins Help Course 09.04.24 Justification for Johns Hopkins HELP Course Staff participation in the Johns Hopkins University, Center For Humanitarian Health in-person course "Health Emergencies in Large Populations (H.E.L.P.)", will enhance the ability of SFDPH and PHEPR to respond to the public health needs of populations in emergency situations. These include the areas of planning, epidemiological assessment, control of communicable diseases, information and surveillance systems, environmental sanitation methods, and managing other complex issues of displaced populations, including the protection of vulnerable groups, building human security, and meeting the mental health needs of affected populations.</p> <p>This course will enhance SFDPH and PHEPR capability to address human rights, human security, and technical components of disaster response during an emergency. These course goals and objectives are in direct support of PHEP and Pan Flu Coordinator job responsibilities, which include coordination of the CDC Public Health Emergency Preparedness grant program and CDPH Pan Flu grant program. PHEP grant focuses on 15 capability areas, relevant areas that include but are not limited to Community Preparedness & Recovery, Emergency Operations Coordination, Emergency Public Information and Warning, Mass Care, Medical Countermeasure Dispensing, Medical Surge, Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions, Public Health Laboratory Testing, Public Health Surveillance, Epidemiological Investigation, and pandemic preparedness. Further, supporting Staff in this workforce development endeavor reinforces our Population Health Division commitment to invest in and ensure future resilience of SFDPH in continuing to build greater capacity to prepare for and respond to hazards and incidents that</p>

		<p>may impact the health safety of the public, including pandemic and other public health threats.</p> <p>Benefit to the Department This training provides the knowledge, skills, and approaches for emergency responders needed to make effective decisions during disasters. The course covers best practices in delivering critical health service support in response to natural disasters and complex humanitarian emergencies. As a member of the Public Health Emergency Preparedness and Response (PHEPR) Branch, this training will improve DPH's ability to prepare for and respond to complex health emergencies that threaten the health of San Franciscans.</p> <p>Benefit to the Community San Francisco is home to diverse and complex populations that are at high risk from hazards including extreme heat, fire, infectious disease outbreaks, and earthquakes. This course teaches how to approach the needs of disaster-affected populations through a public health lens. The course equips participants to respond to the public health needs of populations in humanitarian situations.</p>
PHP Summit 2025	\$2,200.00	4-days PHP Summit which provides a national forum for emergency preparedness planners to learn best practices that can be applied to local programs. Cost includes return flight, hotel and food. Number of people: one

Budget items - Subcontracts			
Name	FTE	Cost	Budget justification
San Francisco Public Health Foundation	100.0%	\$103,660.04	Contractor to hire consultants to conduct public health emergency preparedness planning activities, trainings, exercises, and special projects to produce deliverables required within the Public Health Emergency Preparedness (PHEP) grant cooperative agreement. A copy of the contract will be submitted to CDPH for approval prior to executing the contract.

Budget items - Training/Conference Registrations		
Name	Cost	Budget justification
HELP Course Summer 2024 Registration	\$2,200.00	Registration fees for the HELP Course which provides intensive training in the public health principles of disaster preparedness and disaster management. The course was founded to apply public health principles to the humanitarian needs of populations affected by disasters, both natural and conflict-related, Cost includes return flight, hotel and food. Number of people: one
EPTW Conference Registration	\$300.00	Registration fees for the 3-days emergency preparedness training workshop which provides a forum for personnel from PHEP in California to learn and share best practices from statewide partners. Number of people: One
PHP Summit 2025 Registration	\$700.00	Registration fees for the 4-days PHP Summit attendance which provides a national forum for emergency preparedness planners to learn best practices that can be applied to local programs. Number of people: One
Various trainings	\$3,000.00	This is for PHEPR staff to attend various trainings which are fulfilling all Functions and Capabilities within the grant.

Invoices						
Tracking Number	Billing Period	Total Expenses	Total Advanced Payment	Total Payout	Date Submitted	Status
INV000000158	July 1, 2024 - December 31, 2024	\$98,394.87	(\$128,799.75)	\$0.00	Not submitted	New

Public Health Emergency Preparedness - PHEP FY 24-25 - 23-24 PHEP Base Extension

Spend Plan Summary

Summary	
Organization	SAN FRANCISCO
Grant program	Public Health Emergency Preparedness
Grant period	July 1, 2024 - June 30, 2025
Total allocation	\$233,445.09
Indirect cost basis	Direct
Indirect cost rate	5.0%
Status	Approved

Invoices Summary	
Category	Total
Personnel	\$0.00
Personnel Fringe	\$0.00
Operating Expenses	\$0.00
In-State Travel	\$0.00
Out-of-State Travel	\$0.00
Equipment	\$0.00
Subcontracts	\$0.00
Other Expenses	\$0.00

Total Direct	\$0.00
Total Indirect	\$0.00
Total Advanced Payments	\$0.00
Total Invoices	\$0.00

Budget Summary	
Category	Total
Personnel	\$78,709.34
Personnel Fringe	\$34,695.10
Operating Expenses	\$55,350.74
In-State Travel	\$0.00
Out-of-State Travel	\$0.00
Equipment	\$53,573.48
Subcontracts	\$0.00
Other Expenses	\$0.00
Total Direct	\$222,328.66
Total Indirect	\$11,116.43
Total Budgeted	\$233,445.09

Budget items - Personnel													
Name	Time (months)	Position	FTE	Salary	Salary cost	Fringe percentage	Fringe	Fringe cost	Total cost	Total annual cost	Position filled	Budget justification	
Melissa Ta	12.0	PHEP Manager	10.0%	\$144,532.00	\$14,453.20	39.99%	\$57,798.35	\$5,779.84	\$20,233.03	\$20,233.04	True	Public Health Emergency Preparedness (PHEP) Manager provides general program oversight and coverage of roles and responsibilities within the grant.	
Alice Wong	12.0	Community Planning Coordinator	53.0%	\$121,238.00	\$64,256.14	45.0%	\$54,557.10	\$28,915.26	\$93,171.40	\$93,171.40	True	Responsible for engaging a variety of community sectors to enhance community resiliency and ensure that needs of at-risk populations are included in emergency planning and exercises. Participate in Mass Care & Shelter Work Group meetings to support public health medical mission in general population shelters.	

Budget items - Operating Expenses		
Name	Cost	Budget justification
Biofire Reagents	\$46,210.70	"Building the local jurisdiction Public Health Laboratory capacity to test for emerging pathogens will help increase San Francisco's ability to sufficiently address the following PHEP Targets: Domain 6, Domain Outcome 1 Maintain full ability to conduct accurate laboratory tests to identify biological agents, Domain Activity 2 Conduct Laboratory Testing, Capability 12 Public Health Laboratory, Activity 9 LHDs, whose jurisdiction includes a public health lab, will maintain lab workforce for surge capacity, preventative maintenance agreements and standard laboratory checklist requirements for staffing and equipment, Function 1 Conduct laboratory testing and report results, and Output 9 A process for maintaining lab functionality during a surge. This is a focus for improvement to strengthen San Francisco Department of Public Health's preparedness initiatives in last fiscal year (FY23-24). Purchase of Biofire reagents will allow San Francisco Public Health Laboratory to significantly enhance the capacity to perform testing for the Respiratory and Gastrointestinal (GI) panels. These panels are capable of detecting over 20 different organisms, allowing us to swiftly identify infections of unknown etiology. This capability is particularly critical during outbreak scenarios, where rapid and accurate diagnostics are essential. Additionally, the Respiratory panel has become an

		invaluable tool for screening avian influenza, further emphasizing the importance of increasing testing capacity through additional BioFire reagents." Pre-approved by Christina Verduzco on 4/10/2025.
Satellite Phones	\$9,140.04	Purchase of Satellite Phones and service fees for emergency communication redundancies.

Budget items - Equipment				
Name	Quantity	Cost	Total cost	Budget justification
2 Biofire Torch modules	1.0	\$53,573.48	\$53,573.48	<p>"Building the local jurisdiction Public Health Laboratory capacity to test for emerging pathogens will help increase San Francisco's ability to sufficiently address the following PHEP Targets: Domain 6, Domain Outcome 1 Maintain full ability to conduct accurate laboratory tests to identify biological agents, Domain Activity 2 Conduct Laboratory Testing, Capability 12 Public Health Laboratory, Activity 9 LHDs, whose jurisdiction includes a public health lab, will maintain lab workforce for surge capacity, preventative maintenance agreements and standard laboratory checklist requirements for staffing and equipment, Function 1 Conduct laboratory testing and report results, and Output 9 A process for maintaining lab functionality during a surge. This is a focus for improvement to strengthen San Francisco Department of Public Health's preparedness initiatives in last fiscal year (FY23-24). Purchase of a Biofire 2-module will allow San Francisco Public Health Laboratory to significantly enhance the capacity to perform testing for the Respiratory and Gastrointestinal (GI) panels.</p> <p>These panels are capable of detecting over 20 different organisms, allowing us to swiftly identify infections of unknown etiology. This capability is particularly critical during outbreak scenarios, where rapid and accurate diagnostics are essential. Additionally, the Respiratory panel has become an invaluable tool for screening avian influenza, further emphasizing the importance of increasing testing capacity through additional BioFire modules." Pre-approved by Christina Verduzco on 4/10/2025.</p>

Invoices						
Tracking Number	Billing Period	Total Expenses	Total Advanced Payment	Total Payout	Date Submitted	Status
INV000000733	July 1, 2024 - September 30, 2024	\$29,120.47	(\$0.00)	\$29,120.47	March 11, 2025	Needs state review
INV000000736	October 1, 2024 - December 31, 2024	\$26,767.70	(\$0.00)	\$26,767.70	March 11, 2025	Needs state review

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Grant Budget Revision - State HIV Surveillance Program 24-10307
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 4:31:03 PM
Attachments: [24-25 Budget Revision San Francisco 24-10307 APPROVED 4.14.25.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached from the Department of Public Health, submitting a grant line item budget revision to the State AIDS Surveillance Program for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2025, in accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.170-1(H).

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: Zhong, Yuzhen (DPH) <yuzhen.zhong1@sfdph.org>
Sent: Monday, May 5, 2025 4:14 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Quinonez, Miguel (DPH) <miguel.quinonez@sfdph.org>; Heimer, Clare (DPH) <Clare.Heimer@sfdph.org>
Subject: Grant Budget Revision - State HIV Surveillance Program 24-10307

Hello,

In accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.170-1(H), this memo serves to notify

the Board of Supervisors of a State grant line item budget revision in excess of 15% requiring funding agency approval.

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

Attachment: Budget revision documentation

Best regards,

Yuzhen (Jeannette) Zhong
San Francisco Dept of Public Health
Fiscal Unit - Grants
1380 Howard St, #408B
San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone: 628-754-9473
Email: Yuzhen.Zhong1@sfdph.org



Erica Pan, MD, MPH
Director and State Public Health Officer

Gavin Newsom
Governor

San Francisco County

April 14, 2025

RE: Budget Revision

Dear Sharon Pipkin:

Per your request, we have revised your 24/25 budget for grant 24-10307. Please make sure all forms submitted to Office of AIDS from today's date reflect the updated budget amounts.

BUGET REVISION San Francisco County 24-10307 Term: 07/01/2024-06/30/2025			
	Prior Approved Budget	Revision Effective 4/14/2025	Updated Budget
Personnel	\$ 287,618.00	\$ 5,225.32	\$ 292,843.32
Fringe Benefits	\$ 129,428.00	\$ (25,817.02)	\$ 103,610.98
Operating Expenses	\$ 6,494.00	\$ (3,854.86)	\$ 2,639.14
Subcontract	\$ 184,033.00	\$ -	\$ 184,033.00
Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Indirect Costs	\$ 64,605.00	\$ 24,446.56	\$ 89,051.56
TOTALS	\$ 672,178.00	\$ -	\$ 672,178.00

If you have any questions regarding this request, please send an email to HIV.Surveillance@cdph.ca.gov. Thank you for your ongoing cooperation and support of California's HIV/AIDS programs.

Sincerely,

Lindsey Rosales

CDPH/Office of AIDS

Surveillance and Prevention Evaluation and Reporting Branch

lindsey.rosales@cdph.ca.gov

HCPD14-25 PS 10040627							
State AIDS Surveillance Program							
11580-10001-210851							
7/1/24- 6/30/25							
BUDGET							
KK 720784							
CHAR	S/O	LINE-ITEMS	Grant Award	Budget Transfer	Revised Budget approved 04/14/2025	Amount of change	% of budget line item
REVENUE							
450	448999	OTHER STATE GRANTS	672,178.00	0.00	672,178.00	-	0.00%
		TOTAL REVENUE	672,178.00	-	672,178.00	-	0.00%
EXPENDITURES							
HCPD14-25							
PERSONNEL							
001	501010	SALARY	287,618.00	5,225.32	292,843.32	5,225.32	1.82%
013	513010	MFB	129,429.00	(25,818.02)	103,610.98	(25,818.02)	-19.95%
		TOTAL PERSONNEL	417,047.00	(20,592.70)	396,454.30	(20,592.70)	-4.94%
INDIRECT COST							
020	520190	INDIRECT COST	64,605.00	24,446.56	89,051.56	24,446.56	37.84%
OPERATING COSTS							
021	521050	TRAVEL					
	523000	Field Expense					
	527990	PROFESSIONAL & SPECIALIZED SVCS	184,033.00	0.00	184,033.00	-	0.00%
	581820	Is-Purch-Reproduction	6,493.00	(3,853.86)	2,639.14	(3,853.86)	-59.35%
040	540000	MATERIALS & SUPPLIES					
	598900	Exp balancing budget					
		TOTAL OPERATING COSTS	190,526.00	(3,853.86)	186,672.14	(3,853.86)	-2.02%
		TOTAL EXPENDITURES	672,178.00	0.00	672,178.00	-	0.00%

From: [Validzic, Ana \(DPH\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Operations](#)
Cc: [Bobba, Naveena \(DPH\)](#); [Kunins, Hillary \(DPH\)](#); [Patil, Sneha \(DPH\)](#); [Tsai, Daniel \(DPH\)](#)
Subject: SFDPH Treatment on Demand Report for FY23-24
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 10:25:15 AM
Attachments: [SFDPH Treatment on Demand Report FY23-24 FINAL.pdf](#)

Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors and Staff,

On behalf of Director Tsai, I am pleased to submit our annual Treatment on Demand (TOD, or Prop T) Report for FY2023-24.

As SFDPH submits the FY 2023-24 Treatment on Demand Report and as Director of Health for the City and County of San Francisco, Director Tsai wants to thank the Mayor's Office, Board of Supervisors, Health Commission, and partner departments for their collaboration and commitment.

San Francisco is at a critical turning point in its response to behavioral health and substance use challenges. We have an epidemic of untreated or insufficiently treated mental illness, substance use disorder, and homelessness in San Francisco. The status quo has failed to deliver the outcomes our city needs—we must act with greater urgency, coordination, and accountability.

The attached report reviews the Department's substance use services in FY 2023–24, as required by the 2008 Treatment on Demand Act (Proposition T). Looking ahead, the FY 2024–25 report will reflect the Department's new Behavioral Health Roadmap—a unified, results-driven strategy to expand access, strengthen care, and build a comprehensive recovery system for all San Franciscans.

The Department has launched an ambitious, outcomes-driven Behavioral Health Roadmap to build a system that is faster, more connected, and more accountable—one that meets people where they are and supports them through every step of their recovery journey. Please see Director Tsai's cover letter in this report for the six strategic priorities for the Behavioral Health Roadmap.

SFDPH invites you to stand with us as we implement this work. Together, we can transform how San Francisco delivers behavioral health care—turning crisis into connection, and disconnection into sustained recovery.

Best, Ana

[Ana Validzic \(she/her\)](#)

Government Affairs Manager

San Francisco Department of Public Health

ana.validzic@sfdph.org | 650.503.9536 (cell)

**** CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE**** This email message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use or distribution of the information included in this message and any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete or otherwise destroy the information.



San Francisco Department of Public Health

Daniel Tsai
Director of Health

City and County of San Francisco
Daniel L. Lurie
Mayor

Annual Treatment on Demand Report, FY23-24 and the Roadmap Ahead to Advance a Unified Behavioral Health System for San Francisco

Dear Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors and Staff,

As the Department of Public Health submits the FY 2023-24 Treatment on Demand Report and as Director of Health for the City and County of San Francisco, I want to thank the Mayor's Office, Board of Supervisors, Health Commission, and partner departments for their collaboration and commitment. San Francisco is at a critical turning point in its response to behavioral health and substance use challenges. We have an epidemic of untreated or insufficiently treated mental illness, substance use disorder, and homelessness in San Francisco. The status quo has failed to deliver the outcomes our city needs—we must act with greater urgency, coordination, and accountability.

The attached report reviews the Department's substance use services in FY 2023–24, as required by the 2008 Treatment on Demand Act (Proposition T). Looking ahead, the FY 2024–25 report will reflect the Department's new Behavioral Health Roadmap—a unified, results-driven strategy to expand access, strengthen care, and build a comprehensive recovery system for all San Franciscans.

The Department has launched an ambitious, outcomes-driven Behavioral Health Roadmap to build a system that is faster, more connected, and more accountable—one that meets people where they are and supports them through every step of their recovery journey.

This roadmap is centered on six strategic priorities:

- **Expand Treatment Beds and Services** at the right levels of clinical intensity, including shelters and residential care.
- **Accelerate and Simplify Entry to Care** by creating rapid, direct pathways from street to treatment.
- **Support People to Progress Through Care** by ensuring continuity from crisis to recovery.
- **Pair Safer Use Supplies with Proactive Linkages to Care**, connecting harm reduction efforts directly to counseling and treatment.
- **Build a Comprehensive Pathway to Recovery**, from low-barrier stabilization to housing and support.
- **Prevent Overdoses** by strengthening outreach, intervention, and access to evidence-based care.

This roadmap is more than a plan—it is a commitment to action. We are accelerating access to care by creating clear, rapid pathways from street outreach to treatment. We are expanding capacity and scaling up 24/7 access to drop-in, drop-off, and residential services. We are enhancing clinical services in shelters and permanent supportive housing, and we are ensuring people don't fall through the cracks by strengthening “stickiness”—supporting individuals across crisis, stabilization, treatment, and long-term recovery.

At the heart of this work is a shift from a fragmented system to a unified, person-centered model. One that leverages evidence-based practices, and coordinated care to save lives and create real, lasting stability for our most vulnerable San Franciscans.


We invite you to stand with us as we implement this work. Together, we can transform how San Francisco delivers behavioral health care—turning crisis into connection, and disconnection into sustained recovery.

Sincerely,

Daniel Tsai

Director of Health





TREATMENT ON DEMAND

Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Annual Report

San Francisco Department of Public Health
Behavioral Health Services

Table of Contents

I. Summary	2
II. Introduction	3
III. Overview of SFDPH Substance Use Services and Coordinated Overdose Response	4
Service Organization and Service Types.....	5
Overdose Prevention and Response Strategies and Initiatives	10
IV. Substance Use Services Programmatic Updates.....	11
Growth in Coordinated Overdose Response	11
Expanding Treatment and Recovery Beds.....	17
Growth in Access and Care Coordination.....	18
Hospital Campus-Based Substance Use Services Program Updates.....	19
V. Funding for Substance Use Services	20
Treatment on Demand in the FY2024-2025 Budget.....	21
VI. Assessing Treatment on Demand	22
Substance Use Services Capacity and Service Data	22
Estimating Demand	25
Estimating Unmet Need.....	30
VII. Outcomes and Opportunities for Improvement.....	31
Outcomes	31
Opportunities for Improvement.....	32
VIII. Looking Forward: Challenges and Progress	32
Capacity Challenges and Progress	33
Workforce Challenges and Progress	34
Policy and Regulatory Challenges and Progress	35
Data.....	36
Next Steps for the Coordinated Overdose Response.....	36

I. Summary

This report reviews San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) substance use services in Fiscal Year 2023-2024 (FY23-24), in accordance with the 2008 Treatment on Demand Act (Prop T). SFDPH is committed to the goal of meeting demand for treatment, with seamless access to care, and is striving to increase demand for treatment among individuals not yet seeking care.

SFDPH is also committed to aggressively approaching drug overdoses as a public health crisis, which is critical to our efforts to meet Treatment on Demand. We know there is much more work to do to prevent further loss of life and support individuals with substance use issues on the path to wellness and recovery. In the coming year, SFDPH will continue to scale key interventions already underway under the [2024 update to the City's Overdose Prevention Plan](#), which aims to reduce fatal overdoses citywide; reduce disparities in fatal overdoses with a particular focus on the Black/African American community, people experiencing homelessness, and people living in supportive housing; and increase the number of people receiving medications for opioid use disorder (MOUD) and other high impact treatments. Notable overdose prevention and response accomplishments from FY23-24 to the present include:

- A 32% increase in new methadone admissions from January to December 2024, compared to the 2023 calendar year.
- A 32% increase in the number of clients who received buprenorphine in the San Francisco Health Network in FY23-24, compared to FY22-23
- The March 2024 launch and subsequent expansion—of a new, on-demand telehealth program to connect people who use opioids with medications for opioid use disorder (MOUD). In its first nine months of operation, this program served 1,923 individuals, half of whom began MOUD.
- In the first 9 months of 2024, there was a 33% increase in the number of people participating in contingency management, which is the most effective treatment for stimulant use disorder. SFDPH has increased to 10 contingency management programs, with more planned for 2025.

SFDPH assesses treatment demand and utilization using proxy measures while working to develop stronger estimates of demand and unmet need. Across SFDPH's substance use services, we saw increases in admissions and numbers of individuals served in FY23-24. Drug Medi-Cal-funded residential treatment admissions increased 35% in FY23-24, while outpatient treatment and opioid treatment program admissions increased by about 25% over FY22-23 admissions.

To better address demand for treatment and unmet need, SFDPH continued to expand key interventions in FYs 23-25, including the addition of treatment and transitional recovery beds and leading applications for state funding to support the development of more than 50 substance use disorder and enhanced dual diagnosis treatment beds, among other projects.

Clinics including Zuckerberg San Francisco General's Opioid Treatment Outpatient Program continued to expand services and hours to improve access to substance use treatment, while SFDPH also continued to expand options to deliver street- and housing-based care. Efforts included tripling the number of street health workers and adding behavioral health clinicians to street teams; telehealth medications for opioid use disorder treatment; home medication delivery to people in permanent supportive housing; and the full expansion of the Permanent Housing Advanced Clinical Services (PHACS) Program, bringing physical and behavioral health care and case management to all site-based permanent supportive housing. SFDPH continues to invest in access and care coordination: SFDPH's Office of Coordinated Care (OCC) served over 8,500 distinct individuals in FY23-24. Despite a nationwide shortage of behavioral health professionals, SFDPH has successfully hired more than 45 new behavioral health clinicians, case managers, and other team members to staff the OCC.

Additionally, in early 2025, SFDPH received a preliminary estimate of the size of the population that uses substances in San Francisco, providing a foundation for further analysis to better assess unmet need for treatment within this population.

SFDPH has worked aggressively since the last Treatment on Demand report to address capacity, workforce, policy, and data challenges, with real progress. Going forward, SFDPH continues to pursue the highest-impact strategies available to address unmet need and fully realize treatment on demand. These include:

- Expanding treatment beds and capacity where needed and contracting for new and as-needed services faster.
- Expanding access to highly effective treatment. This includes medication treatment for opioid use disorder and contingency management for stimulant use disorder.
- Continuing to refine use of available data and seek new data sources to improve measurement of demand and need, as well as the effectiveness of substance use services.

II. Introduction

The San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH, or the Department), Behavioral Health Services (BHS) submits this report in compliance with the 2008 Treatment on Demand Act (TOD, or Proposition T). Treatment on Demand requires SFDPH to report to the Board of Supervisors each year on its efforts to meet demand for substance use treatment and services. Proposition T is intended to ensure that the City has adequate capacity to meet the community demand for publicly funded substance use treatment.

The Treatment on Demand Act amended Chapter 19 of the San Francisco City & County Administrative Code to include Section 19A.30 as follows:

1. *The Department of Public Health shall maintain an adequate level of free and low-cost medical substance abuse services and residential treatment slots commensurate with the demand for these services.*

2. *Demand shall be measured by the total number of filled medical substance abuse slots¹ plus, the total number of individuals seeking such slots as well as the total number of filled residential treatment slots² plus, the number of individuals seeking such slots.*
3. *The City and County shall be flexible in providing various treatment modalities for both residential substance abuse treatment services and medical substance abuse treatment services.*
4. *The Department of Public Health shall report to the Board of Supervisors by February 1st of each year with an assessment of the demand for substance abuse treatment and present a plan to meet this demand. This plan should also be reflected in the City budget.*
5. *The City and County shall not reduce funding, staffing or the number of substance abuse treatment slots available for as long as slots are filled or there is any number of individuals seeking such slots.*

This report describes SFDPH's Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-2024 funding; estimates of demand; treatment and service design; utilization; and outcomes. We also provide programmatic, policy, and strategic updates in the City's efforts to prevent and respond to overdose, provide treatment, and promote recovery.

III. Overview of SFDPH Substance Use Services and Coordinated Overdose Response

SFDPH substance use services (SUS) aim to provide treatment and care to help people improve their health and wellbeing, by increasing their access to healthcare and supporting recovery. The department achieves these goals by offering a range of evidence-based substance use services that are designed to meet people at different stages of change.

Figure 1. Substance Use Services and Stages of Change ³



¹ In Prop T, medical substance abuse slots mean outpatient Opioid Treatment Program (OTP) capacity and does not include capacity for all medication for the treatment of addiction (MAT) for opioid or alcohol dependence, including the use of buprenorphine, naloxone, and naltrexone, whether offered within or outside of a federally licensed OTP.

² Residential treatment slots mean residential treatment bed capacity.

³ Center for Substance Abuse Treatment. Brief Interventions and Brief Therapies for Substance Abuse. Rockville (MD): Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (US); 1999. (Treatment Improvement Protocol (TIP) Series, No. 34.)

SFDPH Behavioral Health Services provides health services that treat serious mental illness and substance use disorders and operates the specialty Behavioral Health Plan for San Francisco County. Additional behavioral health services are provided within the San Francisco Health Network (e.g., in primary care, Whole Person Integrated Care, and in SFGH). As a managed care plan, SFDPH must adhere to state standards for the delivery of substance use treatment services. Approximately 60 percent of the specialty substance use services budget is comprised of Medi-Cal dollars and local matching funds. To draw down these Medi-Cal dollars, SFDPH must comply with national standards defined by the American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM) and adopted by the California Department of Health Care Services. ASAM defines substance use service types including outpatient treatment, medication treatment, withdrawal management (detox), and residential treatment, and sets standards for these services.

All SFDPH substance use services aim to help people to stop using substances and move on the path to wellness and recovery. However, many individuals with substance use disorder are not yet ready to enter treatment. Nationally, only about one-quarter of individuals with SUD accessed treatment in 2023.⁴ SFDPH seeks to increase readiness to enter treatment by also offering a range of outreach, engagement, and low-threshold services (see **Engagement and Street Care Services** below) to build rapport with individuals, mitigate harm from their substance use, and build motivation for treatment.⁵ SFDPH also participates in inter-agency, collaborative efforts to provide coordinated, proactive care and services to people who use drugs and are experiencing homelessness.⁶

SFDPH's treatment and engagement services are offered in alignment with the San Francisco Overdose Prevention Plan (see **Overdose Prevention and Response Strategies and Initiatives**, below). Overdose prevention and response strategies are critical to saving lives, engaging individuals in care, and realizing treatment on demand.

Service Organization and Service Types

SFDPH offers substance use treatment in all care settings including specialty behavioral health programs, ambulatory care programs (e.g. Primary Care, Jail Health, and Whole Person Integrated Care), and Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital, in addition to providing outreach and engagement, access and navigation, and street-based services.

⁴ Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2024). 2023 Companion infographic report: Results from the 2021, 2022, and 2023 National Surveys on Drug Use and Health (SAMHSA Publication No. PEP24-07-020). Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. <https://www.samhsa.gov/data/report/2021-2022-2023-nsduh-infographic>.

⁵ Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Low Barrier Models of Care for Substance Use Disorders. Advisory. Publication No. PEP23-02-00005. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2023.

⁶ For more, see <https://www.sf.gov/street-care>.

Treatment Programs in Specialty and Ambulatory Care

SFDPH Behavioral Health Services (BHS) offers substance use treatment required by California Drug Medi-Cal. The services BHS offers are referred to as **“specialty” care, treatment, or services** because behavioral health is a specialty outside of general primary care (as is, for example, cardiology). SFDPH also offers substance use services through its Ambulatory Care (Primary Care, Jail Health, and Whole-Person Integrated Care) clinics and programs.

Treatment modalities are described below.

- **Outpatient treatment:** Outpatient treatment includes psychosocial services (counseling or therapy), medication treatment, and contingency management.
 - **Contingency management:** Contingency management is an outpatient behavioral therapy based on psychology principles of learned behavior in which positive behavioral changes – such as abstinence from drugs – are reinforced or rewarded using incentives. It is the most effective treatment for stimulant use disorder and, together with medications, is also effective in improving health outcomes in opioid use disorder, alcohol use disorder, and tobacco use disorder.^{7 8}
- **Opioid Treatment Programs:** SFDPH offers medications for opioid use disorders (MOUD) under Drug Medi-Cal requirements. MOUD is the most effective treatment for reducing death and improving health outcomes among people with opioid use disorder. Methadone is only available in licensed Opioid Treatment Programs (OTPs) and in limited clinical settings for a 72-hour period because of federal and state regulations. SFDPH contracts with seven licensed OTPs. SFDPH also offers buprenorphine—a medication less regulated than methadone—through primary care, specialty outpatient and residential substance use treatment programs, hospitals, and the **Office Based Induction Clinic (OBIC)** co-located with the SFDPH **BHS Pharmacy** at 1380 Howard Street. The SFDPH Behavioral Health Services Pharmacy makes **MOUD deliveries to supportive housing sites** in the Tenderloin and SoMa districts. SFDPH also now offers street-based, **on-demand telehealth consultations** to initiate MOUD for anyone in San Francisco and in partnership with outreach navigators for individuals experiencing homelessness.
- **Withdrawal management (“detox”):** Withdrawal management services are short-term interventions that aim to help individuals safely manage the effects of reduced consumption of drugs or alcohol, prior to undergoing longer-term substance use treatment. Most withdrawal management is provided in an outpatient setting, but SFDPH specialty care also offers residential withdrawal management programs, which are most appropriate for individuals experiencing moderate to severe withdrawal symptoms that cannot be managed at home or in an outpatient setting, or for individuals who do not have a

⁷ Bentzley BS, Han SS, Neuner S, Humphreys K, Kampman KM, Halpern CH. Comparison of Treatments for Cocaine Use Disorder Among Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(5):e218049. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.8049

⁸ Bolívar, H. A., Klemperer, E. M., Coleman, S. R., DeSarno, M., Skelly, J. M., & Higgins, S. T. (2021). Contingency management for patients receiving medication for opioid use disorder: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA psychiatry*, 78(10), 1092-1102.

supportive environment to experience withdrawal. SFDPH offers several different residential withdrawal management options for individuals experiencing mild-to-moderate withdrawal. Severe or complicated withdrawal can be life threatening and needs to be treated in an inpatient hospital setting with 24-hour medical staff, frequent monitoring, and instant access to intravenous medications. All residential withdrawal management programs provide 24-hour supportive care with peers and can safely support people with mild-to-moderate withdrawal in stopping substances and taking medications for withdrawal symptoms. Program may provide additional nursing and other medical staff on site and can be certified to provide services for medical conditions associated with substance use.

- **Residential treatment:** Residential substance use treatment occurs in live-in, abstinence-based treatment facilities that help people abstain from substances, build life and social skills, and improve coping strategies to facilitate wellness and recovery. Time in residential treatment varies based on individual need and can range from 30 days to six months. Clients are encouraged to transition to outpatient care and residential step-down programs upon completion of a residential treatment program.
- **Residential step-down (recovery housing):** Residential step-down (RSD) is a transitional living facility that helps people transitioning from residential treatment to independent living. RSD provides stable housing and support for people for up to two years while they participate in outpatient treatment, strengthen their recovery, and build independent living skills.

SFDPH also offers critical substance use services in ambulatory care and hospital settings, including:

- **Whole-Person Integrated Care:** SFDPH's Whole-Person Integrated Care (WPIC) provides primary care, urgent care, and behavioral health clinical services to people experiencing homelessness, including walk-in, on-demand services at the **Maria X Martinez Health Resource Center**.
- **Primary Care:** Primary Care behavioral health services are available to patients who are enrolled at a San Francisco Health Network primary care clinic.
- **Managed Alcohol Program:** SFDPH operates 20 treatment slots at our Managed Alcohol Program for individuals who want to reduce their harm from alcohol use.
- **Bridge Clinic:** The Bridge Clinic at Family Health Center, at Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital (ZSFG), offers drop-in, appointment based, and telehealth medication treatment, contingency management, supportive counseling, and linkages to other substance use and mental health services, as needed.
- **Addiction Care Team at ZSFG** also provides substance use treatment, starting individuals on medication treatment and providing linkage to ongoing care following hospital discharge.
- **Project JUNO** serves individuals who initiate MOUD while in jail, providing incentivized case management upon release to facilitate linkage to OBIC for ongoing MOUD support.
- **Jail Health:** For individuals in jail with substance use treatment needs, SFDPH Jail Health

Services offers MOUD and psychosocial services.

Engagement and Street Care Services

In the last two years, SFDPH has more than tripled its number of street health workers and significantly expanded options to connect with individuals who use substances and are not in treatment, offering both on-the-spot healthcare and services to facilitate treatment initiation and entry.

Street Care Services

SFDPH—in partnership with the Department of Emergency Management (DEM), San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), and the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH)—participates in a citywide **street care network** of crisis, rapid response, and planned outreach efforts that aim to increase connections to care and improve street conditions. Within this network, SFDPH and its contracted partners provide behavioral and physical health care and case management. All street care services aim to build trust, coordinate care, link to treatment and other services, and provide pathways to stabilization. Team members include behavioral health clinicians; peer specialists; addiction medicine, psychiatric and medical providers; nurses; and health workers.

Historically, SFDPH street teams have included two targeting overdose response: the **Street Overdose Response Team (SORT)**, and the **Post Overdose Engagement Team (POET)**. SORT, a collaboration between SFDPH and the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), provided an emergency response to people experiencing an overdose in the community. Within 72 hours of an overdose event, POET has outreached to draw individual into treatment and teach skills to prevent future overdoses. At the time of the writing of this report, SFDPH is working to combining teams into one integrated **Street Health Team** and is participating in a citywide effort to streamline all city street teams into a place-based, proactive, and coordinated model.

Engagement Services

Outside of substance use treatment and street care, SFDPH also offers services to save lives and help engage people in care. These include:

- **Sobering centers:** At sobering centers, individuals can spend several hours safely recovering from intoxication in a supervised setting and be offered linkage to treatment. SFDPH offers drug sobering at **SoMa RISE** and alcohol sobering at the **Alcohol Sobering Center**.
- **Overdose prevention and naloxone distribution:** Overdose prevention activities are described in greater detail below (see **Overdose Prevention and Response Strategies and Initiatives**). Among many other initiatives, these include training people on how to recognize and respond to an overdose and distributing the overdose-reversal medication naloxone in settings with higher risk of overdose, including supportive housing sites and entertainment venues. These efforts also provide information about accessing treatment.
- **Home-based overdose follow-up:** The **HOPE (Home Overdose Prevention and Engagement)** program follows up with housed individuals to encourage treatment and

teach overdose prevention within 24 to 48 hours of a non-fatal overdose.

- **Substance use disorder prevention:** These prevention services utilize evidence-based practices to build family resiliency among at-risk youth and their families. Services are provided in community, school, and virtual settings.

Access and Organization of Services

SFDPH provides substance use services at 14 SFDPH primary care clinics and through a network of contracted community-based organizations located throughout San Francisco, and in supportive housing, shelters, and navigation centers; street settings; hospitals; and jail. SFDPH aims to make it possible for individuals to access substance use and mental health services through many different settings and pathways, as endorsed by California's Department of Health Care Services [No Wrong Door policy](#).

Individuals can self-refer to substance use treatment services by calling or visiting one of the SFPDH treatment programs, listed on the SF.Gov website, calling SFDPH's Behavioral Health Access Line, or coming to SFDPH's **Behavioral Health Access Center (BHAC)**. BHAC is a walk-in, centralized entry point that can conduct assessment, review electronic medical records for treatment history and care coordination, address eligibility for benefits, and make referrals and linkages to care.

BHAC is a part of the **Office of Coordinated Care (OCC)**. Launched in 2022 under Mental Health San Francisco, the OCC manages behavioral health central access points, provides case management, care oversight, and care planning. The OCC's activities support the delivery of treatment on demand and increase pathways to address individuals' treatment needs.

Figure 2. Office of Coordinated Care Services

Central Access & Eligibility Services: Information, screening, referral and direct connection to behavioral health care.	Behavioral Health Access Line (BHAL): 24/7 access call center and hub providing connection to behavioral health services.
	Behavioral Health Access Center (BHAC): Walk-in center, open 7 days/week, for access to behavioral health services.
	Eligibility Services: Centralized eligibility support to ensure individuals are enrolled in Medi-Cal and other appropriate benefits.
Care Coordination Services: Focused services for priority populations needing engagement and connections to care.	Triage and Care Management: Manages referrals, ensures connections to care after 5150 or crisis contact, care management for priority individuals.
	Street Health Team: Neighborhood-based teams providing outreach, engagement, coordination for unhoused people with acute behavioral health needs.
	Shelter and Supportive Housing Teams: Behavioral health care coordination and linkage for individuals in shelters, navigation centers, and permanent supportive housing sites.

Overdose Prevention and Response Strategies and Initiatives

Since the release of the 2022 Overdose Prevention Plan, SFDPH has implemented key interventions to meet the increased challenges presented by fentanyl and methamphetamine through expanded, coordinated, and data-driven responses, in coordination with partners citywide. Our work has evolved to meet the needs of San Franciscans and the changing landscape of the overdose crisis. The **San Francisco Overdose Prevention Plan**, updated in 2024, can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/reports--december-2024--overdose-prevention-plan-2024>.

The Overdose Prevention Plan aims to:

- Reduce fatal overdoses citywide
- Reduce disparities in fatal overdoses with a particular focus on the Black/African American community, people experiencing homelessness, and people living in supportive housing
- Increase the number of people receiving medications for opioid use disorder (MOUD) and other high impact treatments

To meet these goals, the Overdose Prevention Plan includes four strategic areas, each with key initiatives, as outlined in **Table 1**.

Table 1. Overdose Prevention and Response Strategies and Initiatives

Strategy	Key Initiatives
Increase availability, accessibility, and effectiveness of substance use services, especially those providing life-saving medication treatment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Expand, streamline, and improve access to and retention on medication for opioid use disorder (MOUD)• Expand availability of and participation in contingency management• Improve and build capacity for post-overdose response interventions to target people who experience a non-fatal overdose
Strengthen community engagement and social support for people at high risk for overdose	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Scale up public overdose response education, trainings, and naloxone distribution in settings with people at highest risk of overdose• Expand the availability of care coordination services offered to individuals released from the San Francisco Jail• Support overdose champions to promote culture change and manage overdose education and the distribution of naloxone• Reduce overdose disparities in the Black/African American community• Reduce overdose disparities in supportive housing• Increase public awareness of substance use services and reduce stigma
Implement a “whole city” approach to overdose prevention	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Implementation of the Departmental Overdose Prevention Policy legislation (2021), which requires SFDPH, the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), the Human Services Agency, and the Department of Emergency Management and their contractors to establish overdose prevention policies and training• Collaborating with the SF Port on a comprehensive overdose prevention strategy that covers their sites across 7.5 miles of the Bay shoreline

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuing commitment to a citywide culture of overdose prevention through trainings are available to all City staff and partners Ensuring overdose response trainings, naloxone, and linkage to treatment are increasingly available in all types of City-supported housing, in partnership with HSH Ensuring low-threshold buprenorphine and contingency management are increasingly available in housing sites, in partnership with HSH Training medics with SF Fire Department on decreasing stigma to better connect individuals to care and treatment Partnership with SF Entertainment Commission to host overdose prevention trainings at nightlife venues, and to produce educational materials on fentanyl testing strips and naloxone
Track overdose trends and related drug use metrics to measure success and inform program development and change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Launching public data dashboards to track key indicators, available at https://www.sf.gov/data--substance-use-services.

Program and progress updates on key overdose prevention and response initiatives are discussed below.

IV. Substance Use Services Programmatic Updates

In FY23-24, and through the time of the writing of this report, SFDPH has continued to expand and strengthen substance use treatment and engagement services and overdose prevention and response efforts. Highlights are described below.

Growth in Coordinated Overdose Response

In FY23-24 and since, SFDPH has made notable progress on key initiatives to advance overdose prevention and response strategies.

Naloxone Distribution

In FY23-24, citywide distribution of the lifesaving, overdose-reversal medication, **naloxone**, continued to grow. SFDPH has exceeded its initial, 2022 Overdose Prevention Plan goals for naloxone distribution, which were 75,000 doses annually by 2024 and 100,000 doses annually by 2025. The City increased distribution from more than 135,000 doses in FY22-23 to more than 158,000 doses in FY23-24. In addition to community distribution, the Department makes naloxone available at key points of contact for people who are at risk of overdose, including the BHS Pharmacy, pre-release at San Francisco County Jail, shelters, and street care services.

SFDPH supported a local ordinance requiring local pharmacies to stock naloxone that passed in November 2023.⁹

⁹ For more, see: <https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6275665&GUID=FAD1F150-B33D-4B8F-9700-40757DB8F59F&Options=ID|Text|&Search=naloxone>.

Expanding Medication Treatment

As a key, high-impact strategy of the City's coordinated overdose response, SFDPH continued to expand and strengthen medication treatment access in FYs 23-25.

On Demand Telehealth and Shelter Pilots

As mentioned above, SFDPH now offers on-demand, street-based telehealth consultations with an addiction medicine provider who can prescribe buprenorphine for opioid use disorder in real time or consult on methadone treatment options.

****NEW** Innovative MOUD Pilot Programs in 2024: On-Demand Telehealth and Shelter**

In March 2024, SFDPH launched a pilot program to facilitate on-demand, nighttime **telehealth consultations with an addiction medicine provider** who can prescribe buprenorphine in real time or consult on methadone treatment options for people who use opioids. The SFDPH Night Navigation street care team, staffed by Code Tenderloin, conducts outreach with people experiencing homelessness to connect them to shelters and other city services. Under the pilot, the team connects individuals who say they want addiction treatment with a telehealth doctor who assesses their substance use history and shares the range of treatment options through SFDPH. If they are interested in starting treatment, the telehealth doctor immediately writes a prescription that is sent to a 24-hour pharmacy or is available for next day pick-up. If they want to start methadone, they are connected to an opioid treatment program for intake.

To build on the person's openness to treatment, and ensure the prescription is filled and the medication is taken, the pilot also may provide a safe place to sleep that night. When accommodations are available, people who want to start treatment are sheltered the same night at a shelter funded by the San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, where they can start MOUD and receive on-site care and services such as case management, medical care, medication delivery, and assistance with Medi-Cal enrollment. A team staffed by the San Francisco Community Health Center and SFDPH works with the individual to create a long-term treatment and housing plan.

Given the pilot's success, in October 2024, SFDPH made on-demand telehealth consultations broadly available, increasing from nighttime hours to **8 AM – 12 AM**. SFDPH also aims to increase temporary stabilization beds to as many as 70 during FY24-25.

Medication Flexibility and Access

Methadone treatment is a vital tool to reduce overdose and promote recovery. Methadone treatment is highly regulated, which can make it challenging for some patients to start or stay on treatment. To improve methadone care, SFDPH and the City and County of San Francisco sponsored and successfully supported the passage of California Assembly Bill 2115 (AB 2115) in September 2024. This law will allow California methadone programs to modernize their practices, make practices more flexible and individualized, and promote patient engagement and retention. AB 2115 aligns California law with federal regulations to reduce barriers for

methadone treatment by permitting physicians to provide up to three days (72 hours) of methadone medication outside of a licensed opioid treatment program (OTP) while someone is connecting to longer term treatment at an OTP.¹⁰ While these state rules get implemented, San Francisco secured approval from the California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) for San Francisco methadone clinics to allow patients to take methadone doses home, rather than requiring that patient come to clinic every day to receive their medication. SFDPH continues to work closely with local OTPs to adapt treatment and make it as flexible as possible to better meet the needs of people using fentanyl. Additionally, under the leadership of Supervisor Dorsey, the City passed a local ordinance in August 2024 that requires all San Francisco pharmacies to stock buprenorphine.¹¹

In the last fiscal year, the SFDPH Behavioral Health Services Pharmacy team continued to support easier access to medication treatment, delivering MOUD directly to nearly 100 people across 32 housing sites, under its PSH **home delivery program**. Also, SFPDH's Whole-Person Integrated Care (WPIC) continued to support low-barrier access to treatment: at WPIC's **Maria X. Martinez Health Resource Center** alone, over 600 patients were treated with MOUD in FY23-24.

Clinic Expansion and Improvements

In 2024, SFDPH supported ZSFG's Bridge Clinic and the ZSFGH **Opioid Treatment Outpatient Program** to expand services and hours, including the initiation of a 72-hour methadone program at the Bridge Clinic, which enables people to start methadone treatment outside of an opioid treatment program. Additionally, SFPDH implemented a number of strategies, including navigation services, to increase rapid treatment access even during periods of high treatment demand or when clinics did not have same-day capacity. In the fourth quarter of 2024, OTOP expanded services to include Saturday intakes and intakes at its Bayview Van site, to increase access to medication treatment.

Reviewing and Improving Post-Overdose Response Interventions

Individuals who have recently experienced a non-fatal overdose are at higher risk of subsequently experiencing a fatal overdose. The City has several interventions aimed at engaging with individuals during this critical period and is continuously working to strengthen these programs. Since the last TOD report, SFDPH has also strengthened MOUD training for overdose response teams and emergency responders and developed and implemented workflows to guide street care engagements with overdose survivors interested in starting buprenorphine.

¹⁰ Bill text available at https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240AB2115.

¹¹ For more, see: <https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6696213&GUID=3871A355-1C8A-4C8D-95C6-81D8940F4D90&Options=ID|Text|&Search=buprenorphine>

Alcohol Sobering Center Overdose Prevention Engagement

In 2024, the City adapted its Alcohol Sobering Center to include sobering beds for people experiencing homelessness to begin treatment following a drug overdose. In FY23-24, the program served 385 individuals.

Expanding Contingency Management

Contingency management is the most effective treatment for stimulant use disorder, and highly effective for opioid use disorder when used in combination with medication. San Francisco's contingency management programs have grown to 10 programs, with more to come in 2025, including one focused on Black/African Americans. Three of the current programs participate in the California Medi-Cal pilot, enabling billing for services.

SFDPH established a Contingency Management Stakeholder Workgroup in 2024 to guide programming and is working to spread information about this effective treatment through webinars, referral guides, and fact sheets for partners and providers.

Strengthening Community Engagement and Social Support for People at High Risk for Overdose
In FY23-24 and since, SFDPH has made progress implementing initiatives intended to reduce racial disparities in overdose, reduce overdose among people living in supportive housing, increase community engagement and awareness, and reduce stigma surrounding treatment.

Reducing Racial Disparities in Overdose

In San Francisco, Black/African Americans (B/AA) experience fatal overdose at a vastly disproportionate rate, compared to other San Franciscans. SFDPH is committed to addressing this profound disparity and invested in strengthening community partnerships with Black-led and Black-serving organizations. In March 2024, SFDPH began co-facilitating monthly B/AA Community Stakeholder meetings aimed at identifying culturally relevant overdose prevention and response strategies. More than 30 groups participate, including nonprofits engaged in substance use treatment and outreach. In August 2024, SFDPH also participated in the first B/AA-led Overdose Awareness Day event, led by this B/AA Community Stakeholder group. In January 2025, the City's first **Overdose Prevention Summit** was convened to discuss culturally driven strategies to reduce overdose disparities in the Black/African American community.

Nine new programs have launched or will launch in FY24-25, contracted by SFDPH to Black-led or Black-serving organizations to provide **overdose prevention and treatment linkage services in the B/AA community**. These contracted services include linkage to treatment; naloxone distribution and training; community outreach, presentations, and speaker series; a Black health and resource fair; a community needs assessment; health educator trainings; navigation to MOUD; the development of culturally congruent overdose prevention materials (print and social media); drop-in, barbershop, and health education services; psychosocial mental health services; contingency management; and sober housing.

Additionally, the City has conducted 48 trainings on overdose recognition and response, substance use services, and stigma with Black-led and Black-serving organizations in FY23-24.

To address **overdose in the Latine/x and Indigenous communities**, SFDPH has been coordinating with the Latino Taskforce and convening planning meetings to strengthen overdose prevention work in these communities. SFDPH has also increased the availability of overdose prevention and resource materials translated in Spanish and Mayan languages.

Reducing Overdose Disparities Among People Living in Supportive Housing

A disproportionate number of fatal overdoses have occurred among San Franciscans who live in permanent supportive housing (PSH). This is a priority population of focus for overdose prevention services, including strategies to provide naloxone; peer and staff training in overdose prevention and response and substance use services; and post-overdose response.

Reducing Overdose in Permanent Supportive Housing: 2024 Activities

- I. Naloxone saturation:
 - a. **Partnering with HSH** to develop and present their naloxone policy for providers
 - b. Establishing 24/7 naloxone stations in 100% of HSH-funded PSH sites, 8 non-HSH PSH sites, and 6 shelter/navigation center sites
- II. Peer training and development:
 - a. Implemented a 10-week pilot training a cohort of 20 community members as first responders to address overdose emergencies.
 - b. Trained over 960 PSH residents in overdose response and substance use treatment education.
 - c. Certifying a contract to recruit and train PSH tenants to be peer overdose prevention educators, under the Peer Overdose Prevention Program
- III. Staff capacity and resource building
 - a. Developing a training plan to increase PSH provider knowledge and ability to connect residents to MOUD
 - b. Providing over 15 events led by BHS pharmacists at PSH sites with higher rates of overdose, offering education and real-time MOUD access
- IV. Post-overdose response in PSH:
 - a. Strengthened collaboration between the Permanent Housing Advanced Clinical Services (PHACS) and Home Overdose Prevention and Engagement (HOPE) programs to better support PSH tenants, post-overdose

Increasing Public Awareness of Substance Use Services, Training, and Reducing Stigma

Since the 2022 Overdose Prevention Plan was created, SFDPH has exceeded its goal for **training people in overdose recognition and response**, training over 4,100 instead of the Plan's original goal of 250. Training uses standardized materials, train-the-trainer programs, and includes materials available in multiple languages. SFDPH overdose training takes a citywide, data-driven approach to reach those in settings with high risk of overdose, including treatment programs, supportive housing sites, and entertainment venues.

In addition to community training, beginning in early 2024, the Department began **training SFFD medics** on connections to care and treatment, buprenorphine initiation, and stigma


reduction. Thus far, this program has trained approximately 500 medics; training activities will continue into the second quarter of 2025.

The SFDPH has increased **education to the public** and to people who might need or be seeking treatment. These activities include regular media engagement, including monthly media availabilities regarding overdose fatality numbers; written and radio pieces on treatment programs; and community awareness events and campaigns, including campaigns during Overdose Awareness and Recovery months. Most notably, in November 2024, SFDPH launched its **Living Proof Campaign**, which features individuals with lived experience of recovery and information about how to access treatment (see **Figure 3**).

The Living Proof Campaign aims to:

- Increase awareness that substance use treatment is available and that recovery is possible for every individual.
- Increase awareness that medication treatment for opioid addiction is highly effective and available.
- Direct people with opioid use disorder and/or their loved ones to treatment resources.
- Promote the City's range of treatment services and work to reduce overdoses.

Figure 3. Living Proof Campaign Sample



Living Proof has been shared across more than 100 billboards and bus shelters in San Francisco, and through paid and organic social media. The Department also distributed Living Proof posters to over 160 community organizations and City programs. SFDPH website monitoring showed that during the campaign period, the Living Proof landing page became the most-viewed SFDPH website for behavioral health.¹² Overall, Living Proof made over 72 million total impressions across the campaign's multi-media channels, exceeding the projected 54 million.¹³

[Collaboration to Implement a “Whole City” Approach to Overdose Prevention](#)

Overdose affects San Francisco broadly and requires all City departments to respond. SFDPH is deeply appreciative of the collaboration of many City departments in these efforts. This includes the ongoing implementation of the local Departmental **Overdose Prevention Policy legislation** of 2021, which requires SFDPH, HSH, HSA, DEM, and their contractors to establish overdose prevention policies and have all staff who regularly work with people who use drugs trained in overdose recognition and response.¹⁴ These City agencies continue to partner to review lessons learned in policy implementation and track progress toward shared goals.

SFDPH's ongoing **partnership with the San Francisco Entertainment Commission** to host overdose prevention trainings at nightlife venues and produce educational materials, begun prior to FY23-24, has continued to increase awareness and community engagement.¹⁵ During Overdose Awareness Month in 2024, four nightlife events resulted in nearly 900 people being trained to recognize and respond to an overdose.

[Tracking Overdose Trends and Metrics](#)

In September 2023, SFDPH launched **public data dashboards** to track key indicators related to overdose and substance use services, accessible at <https://www.sf.gov/resource--2023--drug-overdose-and-treatment-data-and-reports>. The Department has worked continuously to refine and update these metrics, including much of the data featured in this report.

[Expanding Treatment and Recovery Beds](#)

Since 2020, SFDPH has **added more than 400 residential care and treatment beds** to the existing inventory of approximately 2,200 mental health and substance use beds. SFDPH applied for and has been awarded over \$70 million in one-time, capital state funds in support of these projects.

¹² Living Proof Landing page can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/help-addiction-drugs-and-alcohol-available-and-lifesaving>.

¹³ Impressions represent estimated encounters with the advertisement (e.g., foot traffic, appearances on consumers' screens). Estimates may include more than one encounter with the same consumer.

¹⁴ More at <https://sfgov.legistar.com/立法Detail.aspx?ID=4891635&GUID=700D50F1-1B9E-4297-8C8C-70C9AA5E3151&Options=ID|Text|&Search=overdose>.

¹⁵ For nightlife materials, see <https://www.sf.gov/information--overdose-prevention-resources-nightlife>.

Bed Expansion in 2024

In 2024, SFDPH opened new behavioral health residential treatment beds using Prop C funding and state grant dollars from the [Behavioral Health Bridge Housing \(BHBH\) program](#). SFDPH's completed bed projects in 2024 include:

- The launch of the **Healthy Evolving Radiant (H.E.R.) House**, a therapeutic residence with 33 beds for justice-involved women with behavioral health needs, through a partnership with the Adult Probation Department;
- The expansion of the 70 new **residential step-down** (or "recovery housing") beds in an existing facility on Treasure Island;
- The addition of 15 new transitional housing beds with behavioral health supports at **A Woman's Place** (BHBH-funded) for women and gender non-conforming people experiencing homelessness; and,
- The opening of **Mission Cabins** (BHBH-funded), a tiny home community with 45 beds reserved for adults with behavioral health needs experiencing homelessness, through a partnership with the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

As described earlier in this report, SFDPH also began offering stabilization shelter to support individuals in starting MOUD, in partnership with HSH. As of February 2025, the program uses 26 hotel rooms for this program, with plans to expand to 70 rooms by the end of 2025.

In total, 2,320 clients received care through a behavioral health residential program expanded under [Mental Health SF](#) in FY23-24, a 12% increase from FY22-23.¹⁶

In 2024, SFDPH's **Managed Alcohol Program (MAP)** expanded capacity to treat up to 10 clients currently living in PSH, in addition to 10 in-program beds at a medically supervised residence for people with chronic alcohol use disorder who want to reduce their harm from alcohol use. The MAP program served 32 unique clients in FY23-24.

Growth in Access and Care Coordination

As described earlier in this report, the Office of Coordinated Care (OCC) plays a key role in linkage to SUD treatment by managing behavioral health central access points and providing case management and care coordination with a focus on priority populations including people experiencing homelessness, who are the majority of those served in SUD specialty care. The OCC served over 8,500 distinct individuals in FY23-24. Despite a nationwide shortage of behavioral health professionals, SFDPH has successfully hired more than 45 OCC staff members, including behavioral health clinicians and case managers.

BEST Neighborhoods

The OCC's **Bridge & Engagement Services Team: Neighborhoods (BEST Neighborhoods)** is a neighborhood-based team consisting of behavioral health clinicians and peer counselors who

¹⁶ 2025 Mental Health San Francisco Annual Implementation Plan, posted at <https://www.sf.gov/departments--department-public-health--behavioral-health--about>.

provide follow-up and care connections for people on the streets who face significant barriers to engaging and staying in care. BEST Neighborhoods is also part of the multi-agency effort to improve the City's response to people experiencing crisis on the street. In 2024, OCC launched two new BEST Neighborhoods teams, increasing to a total of four teams serving the Tenderloin, Mission and Castro, Bayview and Ingleside, and citywide. BEST Neighborhoods made over 9,000 engagements and over 1,300 direct connections to services in FY23-24.

[Permanent Housing Advanced Clinical Services \(PHACS\)](#)

In addition to other efforts to reduce overdose in permanent supportive housing (PSH), SFDPH increased behavioral health services and care coordination in PSH over the past year under the **Permanent Housing Advanced Clinical Services (PHACS) Program**. PHACS is a team of interdisciplinary healthcare professionals who provide care at PSH sites and is a collaboration between SFDPH, HSH, and contracted housing providers. PHACS provides care coordination and linkage to care, as well as short-term behavioral and physical health care and case management services. Over the past year, PHACS expanded to all site-based permanent supportive housing, covering approximately 7,000 units.

[Care for Individuals with Criminal-Legal Involvement](#)

Under CalAIM, the program reforming Medi-Cal, San Francisco has been expanding the availability of care coordination services offered to individuals released from the San Francisco Jail, including people with substance use disorders. The SFDPH BHS Office of Coordinated Care has increased capacity under CalAIM to accept referrals and provide care coordination for individuals being released from jail.

Additionally, the **Minna Project**—a transitional care facility for justice-involved individuals with a dual diagnosis, provided in partnership with the San Francisco Adult Probation Department (APD)—served 113 unique clients in FY23-24. Of the 42 clients who left the program in FY23-24, 69% were considered successful exits, meaning they obtained permanent housing, completed the program in full, or graduated to another recovery residence. Another 29% of those who exited were transitioned to a different level of ongoing care.

[Hospital Campus-Based Substance Use Services Program Updates](#)

ZSFG's **Addiction Care Team** expanded and innovated services in FY23-24, including adding a behavioral health clinician and peer support specialist, and launching an initial cohort in an Addiction Care Team Nurse Liaison Program intended to build capacity by empowering nurses to become addiction treatment champions on their units. Overall, the team served 2,176 unduplicated patients in FY23-24, and prescribed MOUD in 78% of eligible patient encounters.

The **Bridge Clinic** at ZSFG served 842 unique patients in FY23-24. Bridge also implemented several program enhancements including initiating longer-acting buprenorphine treatment, 72-hour provision of methadone, opening morning and evening clinics, and adding consultations with an on-site psychiatrist. The Clinic converted its Wednesday afternoon clinics to provide focused services to monolingual Spanish speaking patients.

V. Funding for Substance Use Services

In FY23-24, the City budgeted \$106,434,929 for substance use services in specialty care (see **Table 2**). Funding sources include \$32,581,873 in Medi-Cal dollars and \$41,873,069 in County General Fund dollars. Drug Medi-Cal matches County General Fund dollars for most services. SFDPH also received \$9,115,885 through the federal Substance Use Prevention and Treatment Block Grant (SUBG) program.

Table 2. Total Specialty Substance Use Services Funding by Funding Source, Fiscal Years 2022-2024¹⁷

Funding Source	Fiscal Year 2022-2023 Amount	Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Amount
County General Fund	\$30,901,561	\$41,873,069
Federal & State Drug Medi-Cal	\$27,349,344	\$32,581,873
Substance Use Block Grant	\$9,800,298	\$9,115,885
Proposition C	\$12,460,020	\$12,549,132
Grants/Work Orders/Other	\$10,763,713	\$10,314,970
Total SUS Funding Sources	\$91,274,936	\$106,434,929

In FY23-24, Proposition C funding supported substance use services, including the Street Overdose Response Team and Post Overdose Engagement Team (\$5.83M); SoMa RISE (drug sobering; \$3.8M); opioid treatment programs (\$3.87M); contingency management (\$1.07M); outpatient treatment (\$1.44M); residential step-down (recovery housing; \$2.35M); the Managed Alcohol Program (\$3.83M); substance use services at ZSFG (\$911K); treatment access and navigation (drop-in services and Behavioral Health Access Center expansion; \$2.14M); expanded behavioral health pharmacy services (\$2.9M); and the Minna Project (\$5.02M).¹⁸

Table 3 describes funding for specialty substance use services by service type and illustrates where SFDPH has increased contract investments to strengthen treatment and services. Investments in FY23-24 include strengthening provider reimbursement for higher-acuity services; contracting for as-needed, out-of-county beds to maintain capacity when residential treatment or withdrawal management services are full; expansion of residential substance step-down beds; expansion of MOUD hours and services at ZSFG's Opioid Treatment Outpatient Program (OTOP) clinic; and strengthening drop-in stabilization, support, and linkage-to-treatment services for women experiencing homelessness.

¹⁷ Reflects contracted substance use services. Does not include primary care or all Whole Person Integrated Care services. Totals include one-time carryforward on contracts and varying use of flexible sources.

¹⁸ Pharmacy and access expansions include staffing for evening and weekend hours and medication delivery.

Table 3. Total Specialty Substance Use Services Funding by Service Type, Fiscal Years 2022-2024 ¹⁹

Service	FY 22-23 Amount	FY 23-24 Amount
Children, Youth and Families Prevention and Early Intervention	\$3,531,244	\$3,550,750
Engagement, Outreach, Navigation, and Linkage	\$10,609,918	\$8,891,710
Opioid Treatment Programs	\$23,652,082	\$24,722,378
Outpatient	\$14,971,137	\$16,911,851
Residential Treatment	\$18,677,730	\$26,566,925
Residential Step-Down and Transitional Housing	\$9,617,186	\$11,599,702
Withdrawal Management (Residential)	\$8,997,808	\$13,302,931
Evaluation, Support & Training	\$1,217,831	\$888,682
Total SUS Services	\$91,274,936	\$106,434,929

Treatment on Demand in the FY2024-2025 Budget

The FY24-25 budget reflects priorities for providing treatment on demand and working to address unmet need.

- The budget continues investments in expanded hours and 7 day-a-week operations at the Behavioral Health Access Center (BHAC).
- The budget strengthens investments in opioid treatment services, including on-demand, telehealth access to MOUD.
- The budget continues investments in street-based outreach and care, including the BEST Neighborhoods team and Night Navigators.
- The budget continues investments in culturally congruent care to address the disproportionate impact of the overdose crisis on Black/African Americans in San Francisco.

The FY24-25 budget includes use of opioid settlement funds, first received in FY22-23 and programmed starting in FY23-24.²⁰ Notable investments in FY24-25 include sustaining existing behavioral health treatment and overdose prevention and treatment investments (\$18.1M); navigation and expansion of access to MOUD (\$7.2M); and continued investments in high-impact interventions (\$7.8M), which include methadone expansion, contingency management, and programs that aim to reduce overdoses in permanent supportive housing and among Black/African Americans.

¹⁹ Total funding for FY 22-23 remains the same as was reported in the FY22-23 report, but service categories were updated for this report to better reflect current service activities.

²⁰ In May 2023, San Francisco announced historic settlements with pharmacy chains and distributors that totals \$290 million (through FY 38-39) for their role in fueling the opioid epidemic.

Mayor Lurie has named responding to the opioid epidemic and strengthening the behavioral health system as priorities despite a challenging fiscal picture for the City. The Department looks forward to working with the Mayor on his FY 2025-26 budget proposal.

VI. Assessing Treatment on Demand

SFDPH uses several proxy measures to assess demand for treatment, including trends in treatment entry and wait times. Below, we describe the current system capacity and service data, in addition to available proxy measures for demand.

Substance Use Services Capacity and Service Data

In FY23-24, 4,978 individuals received a substance use service from SFDPH specialty behavioral health care, an increase from FY 22-23 (4,628).²¹ Similar to FY22-23, 69 percent of individuals receiving specialty substance use services in FY23-24 were people experiencing homelessness (PEH), and 44 percent (N= 2,185) also had a mental health diagnosis.

Among individuals who received specialty substance use services, 45% were white (N=2,156), 25% Black/African American (N=1,215), and 21% Latine/x (N=933), as in previous years.²² The numbers of Latine/x and Black/African American clients continue to be disproportionately large relative to the size of their populations in San Francisco.²³ As in FY22-23, individuals who received specialty substance use services in FY23-24 were primarily 25-44 (51%, N=2,533) and 45-60 (30%, N=1,500).²²


Opioids were the primary substances used among people who received specialty substance use services in FY23-24 (see **Figure 4**).

²¹ Source: Avatar substance use treatment admissions.

²² Source: BHS Avatar data reported to EQRO, FY 2023-24.


²³ Census 2020: Relative San Francisco Population Size, 5% African American, 15% Latino/a, 44% White, 34% Asian.

Figure 4. Primary Substances Treated Among Individuals Who Received Specialty Substance Use Services in FY23-24.^{24 25}



Opioids—especially fentanyl—and methamphetamine were the most common substances identified in overdose decedents in San Francisco in Calendar Year (CY) 2023.

Figure 5. Number of Substance-Related Deaths by Non-Mutually Exclusive Contributing Substance in CCSF, 2013-2023.²⁶



²⁴ Each episode has an associated primary substance so clients with more than one treatment episode may be represented with more than one primary substance.

²⁵ SFDPH presentation for California Department of Health Care Services, External Quality Review Organization, January 2025.

²⁶ Decedents may have more than one substance present. Source: Coffin P, et al. Substance Use Mortality Trends in San Francisco through 2023. <https://www.csuhhsf.org/substance-u-trends-san-francisco>

Table 4 outlines the contracted specialty substance use service capacity in FY23-24 and includes the number of unduplicated clients (UDC) served within each type of treatment. The numbers of individuals served in FY23-24 increased over FY22-23 in every category.

Table 4. Treatment Capacity and Services for FY23-24²⁷

Service Type	FY 23-24 Capacity (at a single point in time)	FY 23-24 Numbers Served (unduplicated within category)	FY 22-23 Numbers Served (unduplicated within category)
Withdrawal Management	58 ²⁸	1,385	1,285 ²⁹
Residential Treatment	258	1,040	830 ²⁹
Residential Step Down	271	437	349
Outpatient	1,424	1,769	1,454
Opioid Treatment Program (Methadone Maintenance)	4,198	2,504	2,352
Buprenorphine treatment provided across San Francisco Health Network ³⁰	---	3,905	2,949
Primary Prevention – Children, Youth, and Families ³¹	---	1,189	1,109

²⁷ Sources: Contracted capacity for all service types except opioid treatment programs, which reflects licensed capacity. Numbers served taken from Avatar substance use treatment admissions in FY23-24.

²⁸ Reflects fixed contracted capacity. In FY23-24, 8 out-of-county, as-needed beds were also contracted to extend capacity as needed.

²⁹ May be not be unduplicated within this category.

³⁰ SFDPH internal buprenorphine dataset, limited to prescriptions for SFHN patients. Includes data from all SFDPH settings including hospitals and jails. This differs from the CURES data (displayed on [SF.gov](https://sf.gov)) which includes buprenorphine prescriptions from all licensed providers in San Francisco (not limited to SFHN) but does not include prescriptions from institutional settings such as hospital and jails.

³¹ Inclusive of Japanese Community Youth Council, Horizons Unlimited, YMCA of San Francisco, Jamestown Center, and Youth Leadership Institute. Unique individuals served include 941 youth and 248 parents.

SFDPH has additional capacity of more than 1,800 beds not reflected in **Table 4** that serve individuals with mental health needs, many of whom also have substance use disorders. These include mental health rehabilitation centers, residential, crisis, and skilled nursing beds, as well as dual diagnosis residential treatment, board and care, psychiatric emergency and inpatient hospital beds, emergency stabilization units, medical respite, transitional and supportive housing, and mental health co-ops.


Estimating Demand

Current indicators of demand are described below. The Department is continually working to develop stronger measures of demand and better estimate unmet need among individuals not seeking care.

Service Utilization


Admissions into services, and the total numbers served, help to indicate the demand for services. Across SFDPH's substance use services, we saw increases in admissions and numbers of individuals served in FY23-24. As illustrated by **Figure 6**, the number of monthly admissions to specialty substance use services has been on an increasing trend since FY22-23.

Figure 6. Number of Specialty Substance Use Service Admissions per Month, July 2022 - June 2024



As illustrated in **Figure 7**, Drug Medi-Cal residential treatment admissions increased 35 percent in FY23-24, while outpatient treatment and opioid treatment program admissions increased by about 25 percent over FY22-23 admissions.


Figure 7. Number of Admissions by Substance Use Treatment Modality: FY22-23 and FY23-24 Comparison ³²



The total number of clients served increased across treatment modalities in FY23-24, as illustrated by Figure 8. This includes a 28 percent increase in the number of people served in Drug Medi-Cal residential treatment, and a 23 percent increase in the number of people served in outpatient substance use treatment.

³² Avatar data is used to track admissions. “DMC” stands for Drug Medi-Cal. Withdrawal management and residential treatment “non-DMC” reflect Salvation Army admission episodes.

Figure 8. Number of Unique Clients Served by Substance Use Treatment Modality: FY22-23 and FY23-24 Comparison ³³



Service Utilization Across the San Francisco Health Network

The number of unique individuals who received a substance use service in the San Francisco Health Network (SFHN) **increased about 4.5 percent** in FY23-24, compared to FY22-23.

Table 5. Unique Individuals Receiving a Substance Use Service in the San Francisco Health Network, Fiscal Years 2022-2024 ³⁴

Number of unique individuals receiving a substance use service in the SF Health Network	FY22-23	FY23-24
	13,951	14,581

This measure reflects the significant substance use services and treatment provided in the SFHN outside of specialty behavioral health and includes individuals receiving treatment for a condition related to their substance use diagnosis.

³³ Avatar data. “DMC” stands for Drug Medi-Cal. Residential Step Down has been marked as non-DMC. Salvation Army does not have billed services in Avatar, so their numbers reflect unique clients admitted by treatment modality.

³⁴ This measure counts unique individuals diagnosed with a substance use disorder receiving care in treatment settings across the SF Health Network. Individuals are counted once in the measure but may have received more than one service. Please note this metric may undercount the number served. Due to alternative reporting methods, data from some withdrawal management and residential programs are not captured in this metric. Additionally, this does not include individuals served in drug sobering and street care.

MOUD Utilization

The number of total clients who received buprenorphine increased in FY23-24. The number of clients who received buprenorphine in the San Francisco Health Network increased by 32 percent in FY23-24, compared to FY22-23 (3,905 versus 2,949, respectively).³⁰

Methadone admissions also increased: there was a 32% increase in new methadone admissions in Calendar Year (CY) 2024, as compared to CY 2023 (1,541 and 1,166 new admissions per CY, respectively). For the year, the total unique number of individuals on methadone in FY23-24 was up 6.5 percent over the prior fiscal year (**Table 6**).

Table 6. Number of Unique Individuals Who Received Methadone Treatment in San Francisco, Fiscal Years 2022-2024³⁵

Number of unique individuals who received methadone treatment in San Francisco	FY22-23	FY23-24
	2,352	2,504

On-Demand Telehealth Pilot Utilization

SFDPH's new on-demand telehealth program connects people who use opioids with an addiction medicine provider who can prescribe buprenorphine or connect them to methadone treatment during a street-based telehealth visit. Program utilization demonstrates demand for the service: from program launch in March 2024 through the end of December 2024, this program served 1,923 individuals, **half of whom began MOUD**. On September 30th, 2024, the program expanded to 16 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Additionally, from its launch in March to December 2024, 338 clients entered the related pilot program that provides temporary shelter and stabilization services to on-demand telehealth clients. Nearly 50% of stabilization clients exited to shelter, residential treatment, housing, relocation services, or withdrawal management. To date, 75% of all clients in this program have successfully initiated MOUD. This program also served 22 pregnant clients with substance use disorder, linking them and their partners to both substance use treatment and medical care.

Contingency Management Utilization

As the City has continued to expand its contingency management programs—which are the most effective treatment for stimulant use disorder—utilization of this service has increased. San Francisco's contingency management programs have grown to 10 programs, with more to come in 2025, and the City is on target to meet the Overdose Prevention Plan goal of increasing the number of people participating in contingency management by 25%. In the first three quarters of CY 2024, the number of clients increased by about 33% (from 190 to 252).³⁶

³⁵ Number of individuals receiving at least one prescription for methadone during the reporting period.

³⁶ CY 2024 fourth-quarter data is not yet finalized.

Sobering Center Utilization

The Alcohol Sobering Center was adapted in 2024 to include beds for individuals experiencing homelessness to begin treatment following a drug overdose and saw a demand for this service. From its launch in May through Dec 2024, there were 70 care episodes (51 unique clients), during which 35% accepted MOUD and 8 clients (16% of unduplicated clients) discharged to residential substance use treatment.

Intake Capacity and Wait Times

SFDPH also uses the intake capacity reported by residential care providers to be an additional estimate of demand for services. Intake capacity reflects available, staffed beds, as reported by providers by 10 AM each day. Even when demand is high, some intake capacity is ideal to allow flexibility to provide beds for new admissions in a timely manner. Intake capacity overall grew in most modalities last fiscal year, compared to the prior year.

Table 7. Average Daily Intake Capacity in Residential Treatment, Fiscal Years 2022-2024 ³⁷

Residential Treatment Capacity	Average Daily Intake Capacity, FY22-23	Average Daily Intake Capacity, FY23-24
General Residential (177)	4.9	10.6
Forensic Residential (40)	6.7	1.0
Perinatal/Women's Residential (41)	1.1	1.0
Residential Stepdown (271)	10.2	18.7
Withdrawal Management (58) ²⁸	12.8	20.8

Depending on the type of data available from substance use treatment programs, wait times may be calculated from first request for service to admission, or from an individual needs assessment (Level of Care Assessment) to admission. In FY23-24, median wait times remained steady or decreased over FY 22-23. **Residential wait times decreased** from five to four days in FY23-24. Individuals awaiting admission into residential treatment may receive care in withdrawal management or sobering or outpatient programs.

What SFDPH can currently measure for residential withdrawal management is the time from completion of an initial assessment to admission into a withdrawal management bed. For that measure, the median wait time continues to be less than one day. However, this does not capture wait prior to assessment or the number of individuals who do not complete an initial assessment.³⁸ SFDPH is working closely with withdrawal management providers to improve measurement of wait times from first request or referral to admission, including by introducing


³⁷ Capacity totals are based on voluntary provider reporting for findtreatment-sf.org. Days without data submitted left out of daily intake capacity analysis. FY22-23 intake capacity data was updated to improve data quality.

³⁸ Residential withdrawal management non-admission may occur for several reasons, often including complex medical needs other behavioral health needs that require different levels of care. In some cases, individuals choose to leave prior to assessment or admission.

a revised **Timely Access Policy** in September 2024 that requires Drug Medi-Cal providers to report reasons why a client did not receive same- or next-day care.

In FY23-24, SFDPH also contracted for eight additional, **as-needed, out-of-county beds** for withdrawal management and residential treatment to minimize wait times when in-county services are full. As SFDPH has worked to streamline admissions into residential withdrawal management, the number of admissions into this service has been increasing since FY22-23 (Figure 9).

Figure 9. Number of Withdrawal Management Admissions by Month, July 2022 to June 2024 ³⁹



Estimating Unmet Need

In addition to assessing demand for services, SFDPH has sought to estimate need to inform treatment capacity planning and the development of low-threshold and engagement services that seek to reach people who are not demanding—but may benefit from—treatment.

Population Size Estimate: Individuals Who Use Drugs in San Francisco

SFDPH contracted with UCSF to conduct modeling analysis to estimate the number of people who use opioids or stimulants in San Francisco. Preliminary results became available in early 2025. Using data from 2022, the most recent full year available at the time of analysis, researchers used data from the Epic, Avatar, and UCSF Electronic Health Records (EHRs); fatal overdose data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner; and non-fatal overdose data from the San Francisco Fire Department. Individuals were eligible to be included in the estimate if on any of the three EHRs they were 18 years and had a diagnosis of cocaine, opiates, or other stimulants at any time during the 2022 calendar year.⁴⁰ This model does not provide

³⁹ Avatar admissions data.

⁴⁰ This analysis employed a method called Multiple Systems Estimation (Capture-Recapture). This statistical approach estimates the total number of people in a population based on the degree of overlap between two or more incomplete lists of the population.

information on whether someone has a substance use disorder clinical diagnosis nor severity of use.

When the model used the Epic and Avatar electronic health records to create an estimate, the model estimated the size of the population served by SFDPH who uses illicit drugs to be 15,007 (95% CI: 14,958 – 15,196). When modeling the population size using Avatar and UCSF electronic health records, the estimate is 37,484 (95% CI: 36,147 – 38,820). This higher estimate likely also includes people with commercial insurance, reflecting a broader socioeconomic range of San Franciscans who are using substances and are at risk for a drug overdose.

Next Steps: Population Size Estimate

Many of the individuals in this estimate are already in treatment for their substance use disorders, this population size estimate is not necessarily a measure of unmet need for treatment services. SFDPH intends to now use the population size estimate to further estimate unmet need, considering the number of people already receiving treatment, the severity of the substance use disorders, and the desire to seek treatment.

VII. Outcomes and Opportunities for Improvement

Outcomes

SFDPH considers measures to assess the quality and effectiveness of treatment provided. SFDPH also reports on additional quality measures to the State each year, under Drug Medi-Cal oversight.⁴¹

In the 2024 calendar year, **overdose deaths decreased 22%** over 2023 in San Francisco, which was a significant outcome. However, every overdose death is both preventable and unacceptable, and there is more work to do. In the coming year, SFDPH will continue to scale the interventions already underway. As noted previously, from the launch of the on-demand telehealth program in March 2024 through the end of December 2024, this program served 1,923 individuals, **half of whom began MOUD**. Additionally, from its launch in March to December 2024, 338 clients entered the related pilot program that provides temporary shelter and stabilization services to on-demand telehealth clients. At the time of writing of this report, 75% of all clients in this program have successfully initiated MOUD.

For those in care, one outcome reviewed under State evaluation is the percent of individuals in outpatient specialty care that maintained abstinence or reduced their alcohol and other drug use. In FY23-24, about 81 percent of outpatient treatment clients reported having maintained abstinence or reduced their substance use.⁴²

⁴¹ Annual California External Quality Review Organization (EQRO) statewide and county reports can be found at https://www.caleqro.com/dmc-eqro#!dmc-reports_and_summaries.

⁴² CalOMS data. <https://www.dhcs.ca.gov/provgovpart/Pages/caloms-treatment.aspx>

Client Satisfaction

In SFDPH's *Fall 2023 SUD Treatment Perception Survey* of clients participating in SFDPH funded specialty services, 91 percent of 1,063 survey participants indicated that they were satisfied with their treatment services provided, across domains including treatment access, quality, care coordination, and outcomes.⁴³ About 87 percent of respondents indicated that they received the help they felt they needed, and 93 percent said they were treated with respect. Respondents also expressed high agreement with having received clear communication and cultural sensitivity (94% and 92%, respectively) in the services they received. Overall, CY 2023 ratings were similar to 2022 ratings.

Opportunities for Improvement

The Department performs continuous quality surveillance, meets frequently with providers to monitor deliverables and troubleshoot issues, and identifies ongoing opportunities for quality improvement.

Enhancing Provider Oversight

In addition to existing oversight activities—which include formal, annual contract monitoring and regular engagement and technical assistance with City program managers—SFDPH has requested the City's Controller's Office perform an analysis to see how monitoring, quality management, and compliance of behavioral health service providers can be strengthened. SFDPH and the Controller's Office have initiated this work in 2025.

Strengthening the Coordinated Overdose Response

In 2024, SFDPH developed and began collecting standard metrics from all contingency management programs, which will allow us to track participation and completion, and identify opportunities to improve these programs. SFDPH began intensive quality improvement and technical assistance for all OTPs in the city to support methadone modernization and innovation.

SFDPH is encouraged by the recent decline in overdose deaths but is monitoring performance closely across all key initiatives of the coordinated overdose response. We will continue to assess the impact of these interventions, monitor the course of the overdose epidemic, and adjust and adapt responses as needed.

VIII. Looking Forward: Challenges and Progress

SFDPH continues to pursue the three key strategies outlined in the [FY22-23 Treatment on Demand Report](#) to fully realize treatment on demand and address unmet need. These include:

- Improving wait times for care by expanding treatment beds and capacity where needed and contracting for new and as-needed services faster.

⁴³ 91.3% of 1,063 survey participants rated satisfaction with SUD services at 3.5 or above on a 5-point scale.

- Expanding access to treatment that evidence suggests has the highest impact. This includes medication treatment for opioid addiction and contingency management for stimulant use disorder.
- Continuing to refine use of available data and seek new data sources to improve measurement of population demand and need, as well as SUD service effectiveness.

SFDPH has made progress on each of these strategies, while working to account for capacity, workforce, policy, and data challenges. Each are discussed below, along with next steps for coordinated overdose prevention and response efforts.

Capacity Challenges and Progress

To address capacity challenges within the substance use service system—with the goal of expanding treatment beds and capacity, where needed, to improve wait times for care—SFDPH has worked to analyze and enumerate outstanding bed needs and has several new bed projects planned for the coming year. Additionally, SFDPH is working in partnership with the Board of Supervisors and Mayor’s Office to streamline facility acquisition and leverage new opportunities.

Modeling Unmet Bed Needs

In 2023, SFDPH updated its 2020 behavioral health bed modeling to develop preliminary recommendations for the number of beds needed for 95% of clients to experience zero wait time. The [results of the updated Bed Optimization Report](#) were presented to the Board of Supervisors in February 2024. Upon recommendation from the [Residential Treatment and Care Workgroup](#), SFDPH plans to update the Bed Optimization analysis by the end of 2025 to more accurately project the number and type of beds needed to serve specific populations, including clients with significant barriers to placement. This will create a tool to allow for timely assessment of needs across the system.

Upcoming Bed Expansion

SFDPH currently has 135 beds in the pipeline for 2025. Projects include the opening of the 16-bed Crisis Stabilization Unit; the addition of 66 beds at shelter, emergency respite, and transitional housing projects funded by BHBH; and the expansion of the on-demand shelter pilot program from 17 to 70 beds, in partnership with the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. In addition, SFDPH will pursue potential facility acquisition of a site for a new Adult Residential Care Facility.

SFDPH’s Efforts to Streamline Facility Acquisition

In 2024, SFDPH sponsored local legislation to reduce barriers to bed expansion efforts and make it easier for the City to procure behavioral health beds. This streamlining of administrative processes is particularly important when contracting with private operators located outside of San Francisco, where SFDPH faces competition from other counties for beds

that are in high demand statewide. SFDPH is grateful for the Board of Supervisors' passage of this legislation, which waives the lengthy Request for Proposal process for five years.⁴⁴

Yet, the City needs to pursue additional strategies to achieve timely facility acquisitions. SFDPH is committed to partnering with the Mayor's Office, Board of Supervisors, and community partners to streamline processes to expand its behavioral health infrastructure, including recently passed fentanyl emergency legislation to accelerate the City's procurement process for contracts, grants, and leases that support projects addressing mental health needs, drug overdoses and substance use disorders. In addition, SFDPH plans to pursue the strategies outlined in the Controller's Office's [memo on behavioral health facility acquisition options](#), including using data to prioritize acquisition strategies, building regional partnerships, and strengthening internal capacity to manage new assets and state funding.

New Opportunities: Prop 1 Bond

In March 2024, voters approved California Proposition 1, which authorized \$4.4 billion in state bonds to expand behavioral health treatment infrastructure. The state is distributing the behavioral health capital funding in two rounds under the [Bond Behavioral Health Continuum Infrastructure Program](#) (Bond BHCIP), with \$3.3 billion to be awarded in May 2025 and \$1.1 billion in March 2026. SFDPH is the lead agency for the City's applications for the Bond BHCIP funding opportunity. The City, through SFDPH, submitted applications for Bond BHCIP funding in December 2024 for several new capital projects. If awarded, the bond funding would enable the creation of 100 new locked Mental Health Rehabilitation Center beds, and more than 50 substance use disorder and enhanced dual diagnosis treatment beds.

In March 2024, Mayor London Breed and Supervisor Rafael Mandelman announced the creation of a Residential Care and Treatment Workgroup to consider how the City should expand residential care and treatment and prepare to apply for new state resources from Prop 1 Bond BHCIP. The City's Bond BHCIP applications align with the Workgroup's goals, which were published in a [final report](#) in early 2025.

Workforce Challenges and Progress

Our ability to expand service capacity and increase high-impact treatment is dependent upon having the necessary workforce to deliver care. There continues to be a nationwide shortage of behavioral health professionals. The Controller Office's [2024 MHSF Staffing & Wage Analysis](#) provided a useful analysis of staffing gaps and needs among behavioral health clinicians and health workers, as well as recommendations to improve hiring and staffing levels.

SFDPH and BHS have implemented some of the report's recommendations to recruit behavioral health clinicians, including strengthening the talent pipeline. In the summer of 2024, BHS launched a Behavioral Health Clinician Fellowship intended to help 25 Master of Social Work

⁴⁴ Legislation available at <https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6477246&GUID=35D16FED-945D-48B8-9B50-1DD2FC37258&Options=ID|Text|&Search=Public+Health+solicitation>.

interns enter BHS upon graduation. SFDPH also partnered with the City College of San Francisco to offer information sessions on the Health Worker series to current and former students. Between August 2023 and June 2024, the BHS vacancy rate for the six behavioral health classifications included in the Controller's analysis decreased from 22% to 14%. This represents a net addition of 30 FTE, including both hirings and separations.

Policy and Regulatory Challenges and Progress

Significant policy changes in behavioral health have altered—and will continue to alter—the landscape in which substance use services are offered.

Policy Changes Improving Access to MOUD and Naloxone

As described earlier in this report, policy changes at the local, state, and federal level over the past year were made to support easier access and adherence to MOUD and naloxone. These include:

- The November 2023 passage of a local ordinance requiring local pharmacies to stock naloxone
- The August 2024 passage of a local ordinance requiring local pharmacies to stock buprenorphine
- The passage of California Assembly Bill 2115 in September 2024, aligning California law with updated federal regulations reducing barriers to methadone treatment, permitting physicians to provide three days (72 hours) of methadone medication outside of a licensed opioid treatment program (OTP)
- Approval from the California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) for San Francisco methadone clinics to implement several flexibilities including allowing patients to take methadone doses home earlier in treatment, dosing adjustments to meet the needs for people who use fentanyl, and counseling flexibilities.

As described earlier in this report (see **Expanding Medication Treatment**), SFDPH has been working quickly to implement expanded MOUD access in accordance with updated policy.

Policy Changes Under Proposition 1

California voters approved Proposition 1 in March 2024. In addition to many other policy changes, Proposition 1 made substance use services eligible for Behavioral Health Services Act (BHSA; formerly known as the Mental Health Services Act, or MHSA) programming. San Francisco's current [Behavioral Health Services Act programs](#) provide culturally congruent, recovery-oriented mental health care, and currently serve individuals with substance use issues. SFDPH is working to review Prop 1 guidance as it is being released by the State and to assess how to leverage current programs to meet updated requirements under Proposition 1 by its July 2026 implementation date. Community planning efforts—mandated under MHSA and retained under the BHSA—will be launched pending further guidance from the State.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ Guidance can be accessed at <https://www.dhcs.ca.gov/BHT/Pages/home.aspx>.

Proposition F and Cash Not Drugs

SFDPH is collaborating with Human Services Agency (HSA) on implementation of Prop F, which was passed by voters in Spring 2024 requiring individuals with substance use disorders to engage in treatment to maintain general assistance benefits. SFDPH has partnered with HSA to ensure individuals who opt for substance use treatment are able to connect and get the care they need. This program launched in early 2025 and SFDPH is monitoring impact on treatment demand and capacity. SFDPH is also partnering with HSA to implement Cash Not Drugs ordinance passed by the Board of Supervisors in Fall 2024 which bolsters contingency management treatment options for people participating in treatment through Prop F.

SB 43 Implementation

San Francisco was the first county in the State to implement Senate Bill 43 (Eggman), which went into effect January 1, 2024, and modernizes the definition of grave disability to include those who live with severe substance use disorder and those who are unable to provide for their own personal safety or necessary medical care. This change impacts both emergent psychiatric holds, as well as those who may qualify for a Lanterman Petris Short (LPS) Conservatorship. As part of implementation efforts, SFDPH and the Department of Aging (DAS) have provided detailed SB43 trainings to hospital staff, psychiatrists, and all City staff and health care professionals authorized to initial involuntary psychiatric holds; developed new metrics to track implementation; and created new workflows to improve coordination among agencies to better support individuals when involuntary care may be appropriate.

Data

SFDPH needs accurate, comprehensive, and timely data to evaluate treatment on demand and plan and coordinate services but has contended with data workforce and infrastructure challenges. Additionally, demand can be challenging to measure with data currently available, and the Department must rely on proxy measures for demand, as described above.

In the past year, the SFDPH BHS team has expanded its analytic team and undertaken new projects to strengthen and improve data infrastructure, including the development of internal dashboards for substance use service metrics, and the continued refinement of public websites providing timely data on key substance use service and overdose prevention metrics.⁴⁶

Next Steps for the Coordinated Overdose Response

Overdose deaths remain an epidemic in San Francisco and nationally. We are encouraged by the decline in 2024 overdose deaths, but we know that every overdose death is both preventable and unacceptable. We also know that many of the factors that contribute to overdose risk are longstanding and institutional, and include poverty, racism, lack of housing, and unaddressed trauma. Preventing overdose fatalities means changing the conditions that put people at risk. This complex work requires the collaboration of all City departments and partners, including engaging the most affected communities. In the coming year, SFDPH and its

⁴⁶ See <https://www.sf.gov/resource--2023--drug-overdose-and-treatment-data-and-reports>.

partners will continue to scale the interventions already underway, which are beginning to show success. Among many others, upcoming activities include further enhancements to on-demand telehealth and MOUD programs; implementation of new contingency management contracts and recruiting for additional new contingency management programs under Drug Medi-Cal; developing B/AA culturally congruent overdose education materials and finalizing a plan for MOUD navigation in the Bayview neighborhood; partnering with PSH providers to implement the HSH naloxone policy in 100% of PSH sites; and continuing promotion of the Living Proof campaign.

SFDPH's efforts have and will continue to prioritize interventions that are known to reduce the promote wellness and recovery for people with substance use disorders and reduce deaths from overdose. An overdose epidemic continues and every life lost is one too many. We also recognize that the harms from drug use go beyond overdose for the individual using substances, their loved ones, and our San Francisco community. We believe everyone in San Francisco should have access to healthcare and treatment services that both reduce harms of substance use and progress people along in a path to health, wellness, and recovery. This past year SFDPH aimed to make treatment more accessible and provide more options to meet individual needs. We saw more people entering treatment at every level of care. Yet, we know there is more work to do as we aim to ensure every San Franciscan with a substance use disorder can get care that meets their needs at the time the time they want.

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: 4 12B Waiver Request Forms
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 12:09:52 PM
Attachments: [4 12B Waiver Request Forms.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 4 12B waiver request forms.

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: [CCSF IT Service Desk](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: CMD12B0004338 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (LIB) Department Head (Michael Lambert)
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 11:42:58 AM
Attachments: [Image](#)



Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0004338 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (LIB) Department Head (Michael Lambert).

Summary of Request

Requester: Sherri Li

Department: LIB

Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

Supplier ID: 0000057467

Requested total cost: \$1,100.00

Short Description: Adult International Language Materials

[Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request](#)

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact
cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org

Thank you.

Ref:TIS5858217_w5XLHZcKVzmAlcdZfLaX

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2025-05-08 10:21:21 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004338	Request Status:	Awaiting CMD Director Approval
Requested for:	Sherri Li	State:	Work in Progress
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michael Lambert	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2025-05-06 10:51:46	12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
		Requesting Department:	LIB
		Requester Phone:	+14155574250
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Sherri Li
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Adult International Language Materials

Supplier ID:	0000057467	Requested Amount:	\$1,100.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	\$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$0.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$1,100.00

Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000928129
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-05-06
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2025-06-30

Advertising:	false
Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :	false
Equipment and Vehicle Lease:	false
On Premise Software and Support:	false
Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:	true
Professional and General Services:	false
Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications:	false
Vehicles and Trailers:	false

Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

Abord is a specialized source for hard-to-find books and media in Korean and Chinese for adults and children. They offer a wide selection of books in these languages not offered by national vendors; they are often the only source for a book.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,: _____

I have emailed the vendor encouraging them to be 12B compliant and attached the 12B Compliance Process instructions.

Cancel Notes: _____

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	Ruth Santana	CMD Director:	Stephanie Tang
CMD Analyst Decision:	Reviewed and Approved	Select the reason for this request:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	Abord is a specialized source for hard-to-find books and media in Korean and Chinese for adults and children. Books in these languages not offered by national vendors.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Stephanie Tang	CMD Director Decision:
Reason for Determination: _____		

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:
Sole Source – Non Property Contract
Justification Reason:
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?: _____
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?: _____

Explain why this is a Sole Source: _____

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?: _____
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?: _____

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1: _____

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2: _____

12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract
Justification Reason:

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non
Property Contract Justification
Reason:Has DPH Commission qualified this
agreement as a Sole Source under
Chpt 21.42?:Has MTA qualified this agreement as
a Sole Source under Charter Sec.
8A.102(b)?:

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI)

Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water:	false
Bulk Power:	false
Bulk Gas:	false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)

Question2:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:

These are items that the citizens of San Francisco came to expect us to carry. Not being able to provide these materials to our patrons is a disservice to them.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

These are hard-to-find items. We have tried conducting a search through the web and attending professional conferences.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

It does not conflict. Vendor is still working on 12B certification (please pending status).

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

Yes

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Has MTA qualified agreement as Bulk Purchasing under Charter Sec.

8A.102(b)?:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0004338
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michael Lambert	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004338	2025-05-06 11:12:13		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = b776fb123b1d66d07b464b9aa4e45a36
Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-05-06 11:42:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004338	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-05-06 11:42:29	2025-05-06 11:48:20	5 Minutes	true
2025-05-06 11:12:15	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004338	Draft	2025-05-06 11:12:13	2025-05-06 11:42:29	30 Minutes	true
2025-05-06 11:48:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004338	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-05-06 11:48:20			false
2025-05-06 11:12:15	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004338	Dept. Head approval	2025-05-06 11:12:13	2025-05-06 11:12:13	0 Seconds	true
2025-05-06 11:12:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004338	Draft	2025-05-06 11:11:57	2025-05-06 11:12:13	16 Seconds	true
2025-05-06 11:12:15	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004338	Dept. Head approval	2025-05-06 11:12:13	2025-05-06 11:12:13	0 Seconds	true
2025-05-06 11:12:15	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004338	Draft	2025-05-06 11:12:13	2025-05-06 11:42:29	30 Minutes	true
2025-05-06 11:42:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004338	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-05-06 11:42:29	2025-05-06 11:48:20	5 Minutes	true
2025-05-06 11:12:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004338	Draft	2025-05-06 11:11:57	2025-05-06 11:12:13	16 Seconds	true
2025-05-06 11:48:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004338	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-05-06 11:48:20			false

From: [CCSF IT Service Desk](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: CMD12B0004337 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (PUC) Department Head (Steve Ritchie)
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 3:18:03 PM
Attachments: [Image](#)



Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0004337 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (PUC) Department Head (Steve Ritchie).

Summary of Request

Requester: Vicky Griffith

Department: PUC

Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

Supplier ID: 0000010748

Requested total cost: \$19,494.00

Short Description: New Hire Medical Exam, audiogram, respiratory testing for Moccasin staff

[Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request](#)

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact
cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org

Thank you.

Ref:TIS5855482_RjDbSVjCaSRvwDEC0XcR

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2025-05-08 10:22:15 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004337	Request Status:	Awaiting CMD Director Approval
Requested for:	Vicky Griffith	State:	Work in Progress
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Steve Ritchie	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2025-05-05 15:04:31	12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
		Requesting Department:	PUC
		Requester Phone:	(209) 877-3299
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Vicky Griffith
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

New Hire Medical Exam, audiogram, respiratory testing for Moccasin staff

Supplier ID:	0000010748	Requested Amount:	\$19,494.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	\$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$0.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$19,494.00
Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000927837
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-05-05
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2025-06-30
Advertising:	false		
Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :	false		
Equipment and Vehicle Lease:	false		
On Premise Software and Support:	false		
Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:	false		
Professional and General Services:	true		
Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications:	false		
Vehicles and Trailers:	false		

Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

ADVENTIST HEALTH SONORA supplier number 0000010748 is the only local supplier with CCSF. As required per DHR, CCSF is required to offer voluntary vaccines to employees. Sending employees to San Francisco for these services is not cost-effective, and DPH has faced consistent scheduling challenges in the remote Moccasin service area due to the distance from the city. Due to Moccasin's remote location and the lack of local facilities in Tuolumne County capable of providing these services, Adventist Health is the only available City vendor in the area. We are currently working with Adventist Health of Sonora to complete the process in becoming a compliant vendor.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

Until recently the staff at Adventist Health Sonora that was responsible for becoming compliant was non-responsive. Recent staff changes have given the opportunity for CCSF to work with the vendor to become compliant. Vendor is currently working with the Controller's office for access to the City portal to start the process, but this can be a lengthy process and these services are needed as soon as possible for city compliance with the unions.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	Ruth Santana	CMD Director:	Stephanie Tang
CMD Analyst Decision:	Reviewed and Approved	Select the reason for this request:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	CCSF is required to offer voluntary vaccines to employees. Sending employees to San Francisco for these services is not cost-effective, and DPH has faced consistent scheduling challenges in the remote Moccasin service area due to the distance from the city. Adventist Health is the only available City vendor in the area.		

CMD Director

CMD Director: Stephanie Tang CMD Director Decision:

Reason for Determination:

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:
Sole Source – Non Property Contract
Justification Reason:
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract

Justification Reason:

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification

Reason:

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI)

Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false

Bulk Gas: false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)

Question2:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:

Per the direction of DHS & DHR we are required to offer voluntary vaccinations to our employees. We have been unsuccessful in scheduling the hospital staff to do clinics as has been done in the past due to Moccasin's location. This effort is part of the San Francisco Health Services System Employee Wellness program.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

All compliant vendors are not in the Moccasin area. It is not cost effective to send employees to San Francisco for these services. There are no compliant suppliers locally to perform these health services.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

We are working with the vendor to become compliant. The contract and compliant vendors with the city are not willing to service the Moccasin area.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

Yes

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Has MTA qualified agreement as Bulk Purchasing under Charter Sec.

8A.102(b)?:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0004337
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Steve Ritchie	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004337	2025-05-05 15:14:34		2025-05-05 15:17:28 - Steve Ritchie (Comments) reply from: SRitchie@sfgov.org Approved. Steven Ritchie. Ref:TIS5855464_IQkr3x qFoeOVpTXNK3wX

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = ecc66f0e2b55aa106469ff10de91bf81
Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-05-05 15:17:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004337	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-05-05 15:17:28	2025-05-06 10:46:26	19 Hours 28 Minutes	true
2025-05-05 15:14:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004337	Draft	2025-05-05 15:14:34	2025-05-05 15:14:34	0 Seconds	true
2025-05-05 15:04:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004337	Draft	2025-05-05 15:04:32	2025-05-05 15:14:34	10 Minutes	true
2025-05-06 10:46:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004337	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-05-06 10:46:26			false
2025-05-05 15:14:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004337	Dept. Head approval	2025-05-05 15:14:34	2025-05-05 15:17:28	2 Minutes	true
2025-05-05 15:04:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004337	Draft	2025-05-05 15:04:32	2025-05-05 15:14:34	10 Minutes	true
2025-05-06 10:46:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004337	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-05-06 10:46:26			false
2025-05-05 15:14:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004337	Dept. Head approval	2025-05-05 15:14:34	2025-05-05 15:17:28	2 Minutes	true
2025-05-05 15:17:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004337	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-05-05 15:17:28	2025-05-06 10:46:26	19 Hours 28 Minutes	true
2025-05-05 15:14:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004337	Draft	2025-05-05 15:14:34	2025-05-05 15:14:34	0 Seconds	true

From: [CCSF IT Service Desk](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: CMD12B0004335 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (PUC) Department Head (Steve Ritchie)
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 3:18:00 PM
Attachments: [Image](#)



Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0004335 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (PUC) Department Head (Steve Ritchie).

Summary of Request

Requester: Vicky Griffith

Department: PUC

Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

Supplier ID: 0000010748

Requested total cost: \$19,737.00

Short Description: Annual Medical Exam, audiogram, respiratory testing for Moccasin staff

[Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request](#)

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact

cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org

Thank you.

Ref:TIS5855481_PP0LzlXzMtE8KHJNgHLI

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2025-05-08 10:23:33 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004335	Request Status:	Awaiting CMD Director Approval
Requested for:	Vicky Griffith	State:	Work in Progress
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Steve Ritchie	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2025-05-05 13:10:58	12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
		Requesting Department:	PUC
		Requester Phone:	(209) 877-3299
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Vicky Griffith
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Annual Medical Exam, audiogram, respiratory testing for Moccasin staff

Supplier ID:	0000010748	Requested Amount:	\$19,737.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	\$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$0.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$19,737.00
Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000926787
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-05-05
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2025-06-30
Advertising:	false		
Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :	false		
Equipment and Vehicle Lease:	false		
On Premise Software and Support:	false		
Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:	false		
Professional and General Services:	true		
Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications:	false		
Vehicles and Trailers:	false		

Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

ADVENTIST HEALTH SONORA supplier number 0000010748 is the only local supplier with CCSF. As required per the MOU agreements and DHS, The City and County of San Francisco is required to supply DMV physicals for Commercial drivers' medical exams for all employees with a Class A license. Sending employees to San Francisco for these services is not cost-effective, and DPH has faced consistent scheduling challenges in the remote Moccasin service area due to the distance from the city. Due to Moccasin's remote location and the lack of local facilities in Tuolumne County capable of providing these services, Adventist Health is the only available City vendor in the area. We are currently working with Adventist Health of Sonora to complete the process in becoming a compliant vendor.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

Until recently the staff at Adventist Health Sonora that was responsible for becoming compliant was non-responsive. Recent staff changes have given the opportunity for CCSF to work with the vendor to become compliant. Vendor is currently working with the Controller's office for access to the City portal to start the process, but this can be a lengthy process and these services are needed as soon as possible for city compliance with the unions.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	Ruth Santana	CMD Director:	Stephanie Tang
CMD Analyst Decision:	Reviewed and Approved	Select the reason for this request:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	<p>San Francisco is required to supply DMV physicals for Commercial drivers' medical exams for all employees with a Class A license, per the MOU agreements and DHS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Supply DMV physicals for Commercial drivers' medical exams for all employees with a Class A license. <p>ADVENTIST HEALTH SONORA is the only local supplier in the Moccasin CA area capable of providing these services. Sending employees to San Francisco for these services is not cost-effective.</p>		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Stephanie Tang	CMD Director Decision:
---------------	----------------	------------------------

Reason for Determination:

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:
Sole Source – Non Property Contract
Justification Reason:
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec.

8A.102(b)?:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract

Justification Reason:

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec.

8A.102(b)?:

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI)

Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false

Bulk Gas: false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)

Question2:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:

In order to avoid grievance issues with the unions, the city must provide DMV physicals and exams for all employees with Class A licenses. Additionally to comply with the rules at Dept. of Health Services, employees must be tested for respiratory clearances as well be fitted for respiratory safety equipment.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

All compliant vendors are not in the Moccasin area. It is not cost effective to send employees to San Francisco for these services. There are no compliant suppliers locally to perform these health services.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

We are working with the vendor to become compliant. The contract and compliant vendors with the city are not willing to service the Moccasin area.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

Yes

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Has MTA qualified agreement as Bulk Purchasing under Charter Sec.

8A.102(b)?:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0004335
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Steve Ritchie	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004335	2025-05-05 13:28:25		2025-05-05 15:17:26 - Steve Ritchie (Comments) reply from: SRitchie@sfgov.org Approved. Steven Ritchie. Ref:TIS5855135_GlaID GBfm0YB3oUql0i

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 1dccc70a2b51aa106469ff10de91bf7d
Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-05-05 13:28:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004335	Dept. Head approval	2025-05-05 13:28:25	2025-05-05 15:17:26	1 Hour 49 Minutes	true
2025-05-05 13:28:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004335	Draft	2025-05-05 13:28:25	2025-05-05 13:28:25	0 Seconds	true
2025-05-05 13:27:10	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004335	Draft	2025-05-05 13:27:09	2025-05-05 13:28:25	1 Minute	true
2025-05-06 11:20:46	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004335	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-05-06 11:20:41			false
2025-05-05 15:17:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004335	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-05-05 15:17:26	2025-05-06 11:20:41	20 Hours 3 Minutes	true
2025-05-05 13:28:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004335	Draft	2025-05-05 13:28:25	2025-05-05 13:28:25	0 Seconds	true
2025-05-05 15:17:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004335	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-05-05 15:17:26	2025-05-06 11:20:41	20 Hours 3 Minutes	true
2025-05-05 13:28:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004335	Dept. Head approval	2025-05-05 13:28:25	2025-05-05 15:17:26	1 Hour 49 Minutes	true
2025-05-06 11:20:46	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004335	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-05-06 11:20:41			false
2025-05-05 13:27:10	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004335	Draft	2025-05-05 13:27:09	2025-05-05 13:28:25	1 Minute	true

From: [CCSF IT Service Desk](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: CMD12B0004336 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (PUC) Department Head (Steve Ritchie)
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 3:18:00 PM
Attachments: [Image](#)



Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0004336 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (PUC) Department Head (Steve Ritchie).

Summary of Request

Requester: Vicky Griffith

Department: PUC

Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

Supplier ID: 0000010748

Requested total cost: \$7,832.00

Short Description: New Hire Medical Exam, audiogram, respiratory testing for Moccasin staff

[Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request](#)

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact
cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org

Thank you.

Ref:TIS5855479_hrpoI50wNmyJBT1r93OP

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2025-05-08 10:24:25 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004336	Request Status:	Awaiting CMD Director Approval
Requested for:	Vicky Griffith	State:	Work in Progress
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Steve Ritchie	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2025-05-05 13:35:23	12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
		Requesting Department:	PUC
		Requester Phone:	(209) 877-3299
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Vicky Griffith
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

New Hire Medical Exam, audiogram, respiratory testing for Moccasin staff

Supplier ID:	0000010748	Requested Amount:	\$7,832.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	\$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$0.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$7,832.00
Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000927037
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-05-05
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2025-06-30
Advertising:	false		
Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :	false		
Equipment and Vehicle Lease:	false		
On Premise Software and Support:	false		
Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:	false		
Professional and General Services:	true		
Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications:	false		
Vehicles and Trailers:	false		

Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

ADVENTIST HEALTH SONORA supplier number 0000010748 is the only local supplier with CCSF. As required per DHR, depending on the job classification, all employees must have a physical exam, respiratory clearance fit test, DMT/DOT Medical Exam, and Audiogram testing. The City and County of San Francisco is required to supply DMV physicals for Commercial drivers' medical exams for all employees with a Class A license. Sending employees to San Francisco for these services is not cost-effective, and DPH has faced consistent scheduling challenges in the remote Moccasin service area due to the distance from the city. Due to Moccasin's remote location and the lack of local facilities in Tuolumne County capable of providing these services, Adventist Health is the only available City vendor in the area. We are currently working with Adventist Health of Sonora to complete the process in becoming a compliant vendor.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

Until recently the staff at Adventist Health Sonora that was responsible for becoming compliant was non-responsive. Recent staff changes have given the opportunity for CCSF to work with the vendor to become compliant. Vendor is currently working with the Controller's office for access to the City portal to start the process, but this can be a lengthy process and these services are needed as soon as possible for city compliance with the unions.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	Ruth Santana	CMD Director:	Stephanie Tang
CMD Analyst Decision:	Reviewed and Approved	Select the reason for this request:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	<p>DHR is required for certain job classifications, to provide physical exam, respiratory clearance fit test, DMT/DOT Medical Exam, and Audiogram testing. The City and County of San Francisco is required to supply DMV physicals for Commercial drivers' medical exams for all employees with a Class A license. Sending employees to San Francisco for these services is not cost-effective. Adventist Health is the only available City vendor in the Moccasin area.</p>		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Stephanie Tang	CMD Director Decision:
---------------	----------------	------------------------

Reason for Determination:

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:
Sole Source – Non Property Contract
Justification Reason:
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec.

8A.102(b)?:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract

Justification Reason:

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec.

8A.102(b)?:

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI)

Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false

Bulk Gas: false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)

Question2:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:

In order for certain classification in the hiring process to start their employment with CCSF, the city must provide physicals and exams, respiratory clearance fit test, and Audiogram (hearing tests).

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

All compliant vendors are not in the Moccasin area. It is not cost effective to send employees to San Francisco for these services. There are no compliant suppliers locally to perform these health services.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

We are working with the vendor to become compliant. The contract and compliant vendors with the city are not willing to service the Moccasin area.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

Yes

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Has MTA qualified agreement as Bulk Purchasing under Charter Sec.

8A.102(b)?:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0004336
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Steve Ritchie	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004336	2025-05-05 13:40:55		2025-05-05 15:17:23 - Steve Ritchie (Comments) reply from: SRitchie@sfgwater.org Approved. Steven Ritchie. Ref:TIS5855167_fZfNPx 5VSpwyi5go7i1

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = b252170a2b91aa106469ff10de91bfdb
Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-05-05 13:41:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004336	Dept. Head approval	2025-05-05 13:40:55	2025-05-05 15:17:24	1 Hour 36 Minutes	true
2025-05-05 13:41:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004336	Draft	2025-05-05 13:40:55	2025-05-05 13:40:55	0 Seconds	true
2025-05-05 13:35:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004336	Draft	2025-05-05 13:35:23	2025-05-05 13:40:55	5 Minutes	true
2025-05-05 15:17:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004336	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-05-05 15:17:24	2025-05-06 10:51:51	19 Hours 34 Minutes	true
2025-05-06 10:51:55	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004336	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-05-06 10:51:51			false
2025-05-05 13:41:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004336	Draft	2025-05-05 13:40:55	2025-05-05 13:40:55	0 Seconds	true
2025-05-06 10:51:55	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004336	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-05-06 10:51:51			false
2025-05-05 13:41:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004336	Dept. Head approval	2025-05-05 13:40:55	2025-05-05 15:17:24	1 Hour 36 Minutes	true
2025-05-05 13:35:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004336	Draft	2025-05-05 13:35:23	2025-05-05 13:40:55	5 Minutes	true
2025-05-05 15:17:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004336	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-05-05 15:17:24	2025-05-06 10:51:51	19 Hours 34 Minutes	true

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: Attention: Angela Calvillo
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:17:08 AM

Hello,


Please see below communication from Magick Altman regarding various subjects.

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: Magick Altman <magicktarot11@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 3, 2025 7:11 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Attention: Angela Calvillo

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

Hi! Angela Calvillo, Magick here. I hope you are well. Could you please make sure all of the Supervisors receive this email? Would you let me know when that has happened?

Thank you for all you do for our great city!

All the best,
Magick Altman

Hello Supervisors,

I have attended hundreds of hours of BOS meetings and Police Commission meetings. I attended the hearing about SFPD manipulating the system to receive undeserved pay using overtime and sick leave to do it.

“Crime isn’t out of control because we don’t have enough police officers, it’s uncontrollable because the community is not nurtured.” -State of Emergency, by Tamika D. Mallory I suggest you read this.

Every Black Man is a criminal because of the color of his skin.

Concerning the death of Mario Woods, Mayor Lee said, “It was horrifying; a *firing squad*.”

No officers in San Francisco have ever been convicted of on-duty homicide, but \$7mil has been paid out for unlawful death.

We need programs for our communities, like after school programs in music, healthy food, reasonable rent, decent wages and health clinics, just to name a few that would lift up our neighbors that our suffering without the dream of a meaningful future. I look forward to your responses.

Yours in truth,
Magick Altman

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: Fix-it-Week - LOOP THE SYSTEMS! Allow for bandwidth and circumventing construction
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:19:27 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding public transit.

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: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 4, 2025 3:57 AM
To: Sfmta Info <info@sfmta.com>; Kirschbaum, Julie (MTA) <Julie.Kirschbaum@sfmta.com>
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; cac@sfmta.com; cac@sfmta.org
Subject: Fix-it-Week - LOOP THE SYSTEMS! Allow for bandwidth and circumventing construction

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

Look at the map please and reminder that this constant shutting down and ignoring the loop and link system for LRV's is what is

Link the L taraval up Sloat to west portal,
 Link the T-Third up Geneva harness
 Bring the F_LINE around to the presidio, Chrissy field and south to geary and maybe even sunset blvd....

Run the BRT Van Mess down to Ceasar Chavez and out to bayshore, cargo way, BVHP or loop it back and make 3 hospitals accessible on one line...

That is how you fix transit \$\$\$\$ and acquire more ridership....

Density follows, but only when infrastructure is built and built well.

To date nothing has moved at 19th, and they never seriously looked at 20th Ave to head south at stern grove and pumpkin patch through stones town and south to Daly City.

The options are many, the effort so far abysmal.....

A.Goodman D7

Begin forwarded message:

From: "San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency" <reply@message.SFMTA.com>
Subject: Reminder: #MuniMetro Fix-It Week returns this Monday, May 5, and will run through Friday, May 9...
Date: May 2, 2025 at 11:37:20 PM GMT+2
To: <amgodman@yahoo.com>
Reply-To: "San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency" <reply-febc17737c630d79-14_HTML-97150131-514006382-55@message.sfmta.com>

Can't see the images? [View As Webpage](#)



Reminder: #MuniMetro Fix-It Week returns this Monday, May 5, and will run through Friday, May 9.

- Market St.Subway service will end at 9:30pm nightly, and bus shuttles will provide KLM service btwn West Portal & Embarcadero until 12 a.m.
- #KIngleside & #MOceanView trains will operate btwn Balboa Park & St. Francis Circle.
- #NJudah & #JChurch trains will be "interlined" btwn Balboa Park & Ocean Beach.
- #TAraval bus shuttles will operate btwn West Portal and Wawona & 46th.
- KLM Bus Shuttles will serve all #MuniMetro stops btwn Steuart & Market and St. Francis Circle.
- #TThird trains will continue to operate normally btwn Sunnydale & Chinatown.

For complete details, visit our [Fix-it Week](#) webpage

[?]

SFMTA.com



☎ 311 (Outside SF 415.701.2311; TTY 415.701.2323) Free language assistance / 免費語言協助 / Ayuda gratis con el idioma / Бесплатная помощь переводчиков / Trợ giúp Thông dịch Miễn phí / Assistance linguistique gratuite / 無料の言語支援 / 무료 언어 지원 / Libreng tulong para sa wikang Filipino / ကုန်စွမ်းမြောက်နှင့်ဆန်တွေ့ပါရေးမှူးအေး မြန်မာဘ်ဘာရေးမှူးအေး

This email was sent by:
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
1 S Van Ness Ave San Francisco, CA, 94103, USA

[Update Subscriptions](#) | [Contact Us](#)

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: Policy Ideas to Boost Small Restaurants, Foot Traffic, and Public Safety in San Francisco
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 3:39:53 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding the food service industry.

Regards,

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

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Dev Shankar Mukherjee <devshankar.mukherjee@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 5, 2025 2:20 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Birnbach, Kerry (ECN) <kerry.birnbach@sfgov.org>; OEWD (ECN) <oewd@sfgov.org>
Subject: Policy Ideas to Boost Small Restaurants, Foot Traffic, and Public Safety in San Francisco

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Small Business Commission, Office of Economic and Workforce Development,

I am writing to share some ideas and policy suggestions that I believe could meaningfully strengthen San Francisco's restaurant and small food business sector while simultaneously contributing to public safety and community vibrancy.

As a resident and frequent customer of our local restaurants, I've noticed that many of our food establishments face steep operational costs—often much higher than comparable cities abroad. During a recent visit to Tokyo, I was

struck by how vibrant, affordable, and efficient their restaurant scene is. Despite Tokyo's high density, the average meal cost was 30% lower, and restaurants operated profitably by embracing high customer turnover, small spaces, and streamlined service models (such as QR code ordering and counter payment). These bustling environments naturally created vibrant streetscapes that discouraged crime simply by increasing foot traffic and community presence.

I believe San Francisco could adapt some of these lessons while staying true to its own high standards of safety and regulation. Here are several actionable policy ideas:

1. **Cover Regulation Costs Without Lowering Standards:**

Maintain strong health, safety, and accessibility regulations but have the City fund the costs associated with compliance—such as inspection fees, ADA upgrades, fire code adjustments, and permit renewals. This would alleviate a major financial burden on small restaurants without sacrificing public safety.

2. **Expand and Diversify Commercial Space:**

Incentivize more commercial use of underutilized buildings (e.g., converting vacant office spaces post-pandemic) and allow multi-floor restaurants, as is common in Tokyo. Revisiting zoning policies to increase the available space for small eateries will ease rental pressure citywide.

3. **Tax Relief for Small Service-Sector Properties:**

Introduce property tax exemptions or reductions for smaller commercial properties operating in the service sector (excluding storage and warehousing) to encourage landlords to rent to restaurants and other community-serving businesses at reasonable rates.

4. **Support for Low-Service Models and Shared Spaces:**

- * Create incentives for restaurants using low-service, high-efficiency models (such as self-service water, QR ordering, and counter pickup).

- * Allow and encourage multiple businesses to share a single commercial kitchen or dining space at different times of the day.

- * Introduce a new “micro-restaurant” permit class for establishments under 500 square feet to encourage ultra-small, high-turnover venues.

5. **Permanent Caps on Third-Party Delivery Fees:**

Protect restaurant margins by enforcing reasonable, permanent caps on third-party delivery app commissions.

6. **Invest in Culinary Incubators:**

Fund programs that help aspiring chefs and entrepreneurs pilot their concepts in shared spaces or pop-ups before committing to long-term leases.

These initiatives would not only reduce costs for food businesses but also catalyze a virtuous cycle of foot traffic, public engagement, and economic vitality. More people out on the streets—enjoying affordable, diverse dining options—creates a naturally safer and more welcoming environment that deters crime and fosters community connection.

I'd love the opportunity to discuss these ideas further or assist in any way to make progress on them. Thank you for your leadership and your commitment to improving our city.

Sincerely,

Dev

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: Proposed Development at 1979 Mission Street
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 1:21:48 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding a proposed development project at 1979 Mission Street.

Regards,

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

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

From: Anna Sapozhnikova <drannasapo@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 1:15 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; sffaces@ecs-sf.org; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Proposed Development at 1979 Mission Street

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and City Officials:

I am writing as a concerned resident of the Mission District regarding the proposed development at 1979 Mission Street adjacent to the 16th Street BART plaza and Marshall Elementary School. While our community strongly supports compassionate solutions for those struggling with addiction and mental health challenges, we must express our profound disappointment and frustration with the current plan to replace the Mission Cabins with a facility focused on these services as the first phase of development.

We have learned that construction is slated to begin in December as the first of three buildings planned for this site. Our community strongly urges that family housing be prioritized as the first building constructed at this location, rather than additional addiction and mental health services. I feel compelled to outline several critical concerns about the current approach:

- 1. Inequitable Distribution of Services:** This development conflicts with citywide initiatives for equitable distribution of services supported by multiple supervisors, including Jackie Fielder. The Mission District already bears a disproportionate burden of supportive services while other neighborhoods remain underserved, representing poor urban planning and policy inequity.
- 2. Counterproductive Location for Addiction Recovery:** The proposed site is adjacent to Capp Street between 16th and 17th Streets—an area notorious for open drug dealing. Placing individuals struggling with addiction directly above one of the Mission's most entrenched drug markets defies basic principles of effective rehabilitation and threatens both recovery success and community safety.
- 3. Impact on Vulnerable School Community:** The development will be located near Marshall Elementary, which serves predominantly low-income, Spanish-speaking children who already navigate challenging environmental conditions. Family housing would better complement and support this school community, creating a more cohesive neighborhood environment.
- 4. Unaddressed Existing Issues:** Our neighborhood contains numerous poorly managed SROs that harbor drug use and dealing. Adding another facility without addressing these existing problems represents negligent urban planning and risks exacerbating current challenges.
- 5. Community Engagement Failures:** Despite our good-faith efforts to maintain clean streets and a safe environment after being systematically ignored during the Mission Cabins development, our community has not been meaningfully included in planning for this significant new development.

Let me be absolutely clear: This is NOT opposition to development at 1979 Mission. Rather, we strongly advocate for family housing to be prioritized as the first building constructed at this site. This approach would better serve our neighborhood's needs, complement the nearby elementary school, and help create a more balanced community.

We strongly urge you to:

- Revise the development sequence to prioritize family housing as the first building
- Consider the counterproductive nature of placing addiction recovery services directly

- above an active drug market
- Implement the equitable distribution initiative for supportive services throughout San Francisco
- Address the existing problems of drug dealing, illegal vending, and unsafe conditions before adding additional services

Our community deserves better than to be treated as a convenient dumping ground for services that other neighborhoods refuse to host. We expect our elected officials to demonstrate the political courage necessary to distribute these vital services equitably throughout the city while prioritizing development that strengthens family-centered community building in the Mission.

I, along with my neighbors, request a prompt response and meaningful dialogue about these concerns.

Respectfully but urgently,

Anna Sapozhnikova, Capp st resident.

--

Anna Sapozhnikova, PhD
Clinical Psychologist
www.drannasapo.com
415-742-1291

Confidentiality Notice: The confidentiality of email cannot be guaranteed and should not be used for private or confidential contact or information and therefore should be used only for routine and non-personal business. Email should not be used to inform me of an emergency or acute crisis. If you have received this message in error, or are not the named recipient, please immediately notify the sender by return e-mail and delete all copies of this message.

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: 5 Letters Regarding a Housing Project
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 12:17:52 PM
Attachments: [5 Letters Regarding a Housing Project.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 5 letters regarding a proposed housing project at 1979 Mission Street.

Regards,

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

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

From: [M Ho](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [DHS \(HOM\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT 1979 MISSION ST. PROJECT
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 7:30:38 PM

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

05/06/2025

Mayor Daniel Lurie City Hall, Room 200 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

CC: San Francisco Board of Supervisors CC: San Francisco Planning Commission CC: Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

RE: Proposed Development at 1979 Mission Street

Dear Mayor Lurie and City Officials:

I am writing as a concerned resident of the Mission District regarding the proposed development at 1979 Mission Street adjacent to the 16th Street BART plaza and Marshall Elementary School. While our community strongly supports compassionate solutions for those struggling with addiction and mental health challenges, we must express our profound disappointment and frustration with the current plan to replace the Mission Cabins with a facility focused on these services as the first phase of development.

We have learned that construction is slated to begin in December as the first of three buildings planned for this site. Our community strongly urges that family housing be prioritized as the first building constructed at this location, rather than additional addiction and mental health services. I feel compelled to outline several critical concerns about the current approach:

- 1. Direct Conflict with Equitable Distribution:** This development is in direct conflict with current initiatives for the equitable distribution of services throughout San Francisco that are supported by multiple supervisors, including Jackie Fielder. Continuing to concentrate these services in the Mission District while other neighborhoods remain underserved represents poor urban planning and policy inequity.
- 2. Highly Counterproductive to Improving Street Conditions:** Placing a facility for individuals struggling with addiction directly above one of the most notorious drug markets in the Mission is not only counterproductive but likely to worsen existing conditions. This approach threatens both the success of those seeking recovery and the community's ongoing efforts to improve safety and cleanliness in the neighborhood.
- 3. Oversaturation of Similar Services:** The Mission District, particularly this section, already bears a disproportionate burden of supportive services in San Francisco. We ask: Why continue to concentrate these services in an already heavily impacted neighborhood?

4. **Counterproductive Location for Addiction Recovery:** The proposed site is situated directly adjacent to Capp Street between 16th and 17th Streets—an area notorious for open drug dealing and use. Placing individuals struggling with addiction literally on top of one of the Mission's most entrenched drug markets is not only illogical but potentially harmful to their recovery. This placement defies basic principles of effective rehabilitation.
5. **Proximity to Marshall Elementary:** The development will be located near a school serving predominantly low-income, Spanish-speaking children who already navigate challenging environmental conditions. Family housing would complement and support this school community, creating a more cohesive neighborhood environment.
6. **Existing SRO Issues:** Our neighborhood already contains numerous poorly managed SROs that harbor drug use and dealing. Adding another facility without addressing these existing problems represents negligent urban planning.
7. **Community Engagement Failures:** When our community expressed concerns about the Mission Cabins development, we were systematically ignored. Despite this, we subsequently worked collaboratively to help maintain clean streets and a safe environment. Our good-faith efforts have not been reciprocated with meaningful inclusion in planning for this significant new development.

Let me be absolutely clear: This is NOT opposition to development at 1979 Mission. Rather, we strongly advocate for family housing to be prioritized as the first building constructed at this site. This approach would better serve our neighborhood's needs, complement the nearby elementary school, and help create a more balanced community.

We strongly urge you to:

- Revise the development sequence to prioritize family housing as the first building
- Consider the counterproductive nature of placing addiction recovery services directly above an active drug market
- Implement the equitable distribution initiative for supportive services throughout San Francisco
- Address the existing problems of drug dealing, illegal vending, and unsafe conditions before adding additional services

Our community deserves better than to be treated as a convenient dumping ground for services that other neighborhoods refuse to host. We expect our elected officials to demonstrate the political courage necessary to distribute these vital services equitably throughout the city while prioritizing development that strengthens family-centered community building in the Mission.

I, along with my neighbors, request a prompt response and meaningful dialogue about these concerns.

Respectfully but urgently,

Mercedes Ho

25 Adair St, San Francisco, CA 94103

merceho@me.com

415-861-2523

From: [Naomi Fox](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [DHSH \(HOM\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Development at 2970 16th Street / 1979 Mission Street
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 10:32:06 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and City Officials:

I'm a single parent of two Marshall Elementary students. We live on the same block as the proposed development site, at 7 Capp St. I am also the president of the Marshall Elementary PTA.

I am writing as a concerned resident of the Mission District regarding the proposed development at 1979 Mission Street adjacent to the 16th Street BART plaza and Marshall Elementary School. While our community strongly supports compassionate solutions for those struggling with addiction and mental health challenges, we must express our profound disappointment and frustration with the current plan to replace the Mission Cabins with a facility focused on these services as the first phase of development.

We have learned that construction is slated to begin in December as the first of three buildings planned for this site. Our community strongly urges that family housing be prioritized as the first building constructed at this location, rather than additional addiction and mental health services. I feel compelled to outline several critical concerns about the current approach:

- 1. Direct Conflict with Equitable Distribution:** This development is in direct conflict with current initiatives for the equitable distribution of services throughout San Francisco that are supported by multiple supervisors, including Jackie Fielder. Continuing to concentrate these services in the Mission District while other neighborhoods remain underserved represents poor urban planning and policy inequity.
- 2. Highly Counterproductive to Improving Street Conditions:** Placing a facility for individuals struggling with addiction directly above one of the most notorious drug markets in the Mission is not only counterproductive but likely to worsen existing conditions. This approach threatens both the success of those seeking recovery and the community's ongoing efforts to improve safety and cleanliness in the neighborhood.
- 3. Oversaturation of Similar Services:** The Mission District, particularly this section, already bears a disproportionate burden of supportive services in San Francisco. We ask: Why continue to concentrate these services in an already heavily impacted neighborhood?
- 4. Counterproductive Location for Addiction Recovery:** The proposed site is situated directly adjacent to Capp Street between 16th and 17th Streets—an area notorious for open drug dealing and use. Placing individuals struggling with addiction literally on top of one of the Mission's most entrenched drug markets is not only illogical but potentially harmful to their recovery. This placement defies basic principles of

effective rehabilitation.

5. **Proximity to Marshall Elementary:** The development will be located near a school serving predominantly low-income, Spanish-speaking children who already navigate challenging environmental conditions. Family housing would complement and support this school community, creating a more cohesive neighborhood environment.
6. **Existing SRO Issues:** Our neighborhood already contains numerous poorly managed SROs that harbor drug use and dealing. Adding another facility without addressing these existing problems represents negligent urban planning.
7. **Community Engagement Failures:** When our community expressed concerns about the Mission Cabins development, we were systematically ignored. Despite this, we subsequently worked collaboratively to help maintain clean streets and a safe environment. Our good-faith efforts have not been reciprocated with meaningful inclusion in planning for this significant new development.

Let me be absolutely clear: This is NOT opposition to development at 1979 Mission. Rather, we strongly advocate for family housing to be prioritized as the first building constructed at this site. This approach would better serve our neighborhood's needs, complement the nearby elementary school, and help create a more balanced community.

We strongly urge you to:

- Revise the development sequence to prioritize family housing as the first building
- Consider the counterproductive nature of placing addiction recovery services directly above an active drug market
- Implement the equitable distribution initiative for supportive services throughout San Francisco
- Address the existing problems of drug dealing, illegal vending, and unsafe conditions before adding additional services

Our community deserves better than to be treated as a convenient dumping ground for services that other neighborhoods refuse to host. We expect our elected officials to demonstrate the political courage necessary to distribute these vital services equitably throughout the city while prioritizing development that strengthens family-centered community building in the Mission.

I, along with my neighbors, request a prompt response and meaningful dialogue about these concerns.

Respectfully but urgently,

Naomi Fox

508-873-9603

- Parent of 2 Marshall Elementary students
- Resident and owner of 7 Capp St
- Marshall Elementary PTA President

From: [Veronica Garcia](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [DHSH \(HOM\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SF Resident Concerned about the 1979 Mission Street Project
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 8:56:08 AM

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

Veronica Garcia
1540 15th St., San Francisco, CA 94103
956-341-2023
veronica.m.garcia1@gmail.com

May 7, 2025

Mayor Daniel Lurie
City Hall, Room 200 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mayor Lurie and City Officials:

I am writing as a concerned resident of the Mission District regarding the proposed development at 1979 Mission Street adjacent to the 16th Street BART plaza and Marshall Elementary School. While our community strongly supports compassionate solutions for those struggling with addiction and mental health challenges, we must express our profound disappointment and frustration with the current plan to replace the Mission Cabins with a facility focused on these services as the first phase of development.

We have learned that construction is slated to begin in December as the first of three buildings planned for this site. Our community strongly urges that family housing be prioritized as the first building constructed at this location, rather than additional addiction and mental health services. I feel compelled to outline several critical concerns about the current approach:

- 1. Direct Conflict with Equitable Distribution:** This development is in direct conflict with current initiatives for the equitable distribution of services throughout San Francisco that are supported by multiple supervisors, including Jackie Fielder. Continuing to concentrate these services in the Mission District while other neighborhoods remain underserved represents poor urban planning and policy inequity.
- 2. Highly Counterproductive to Improving Street Conditions:** Placing a facility for individuals struggling with addiction directly above one of the most notorious drug markets in the Mission is not only counterproductive but likely to worsen existing conditions. This approach threatens both the success of those seeking recovery and the community's ongoing efforts to improve safety and cleanliness in the neighborhood.
- 3. Oversaturation of Similar Services:** The Mission District, particularly this section,

already bears a disproportionate burden of supportive services in San Francisco. We ask: Why continue to concentrate these services in an already heavily impacted neighborhood?

4. **Counterproductive Location for Addiction Recovery:** The proposed site is situated directly adjacent to Capp Street between 16th and 17th Streets—an area notorious for open drug dealing and use. Placing individuals struggling with addiction literally on top of one of the Mission's most entrenched drug markets is not only illogical but potentially harmful to their recovery. This placement defies basic principles of effective rehabilitation.
5. **Proximity to Marshall Elementary:** The development will be located near a school serving predominantly low-income, Spanish-speaking children who already navigate challenging environmental conditions. Family housing would complement and support this school community, creating a more cohesive neighborhood environment.
6. **Existing SRO Issues:** Our neighborhood already contains numerous poorly managed SROs that harbor drug use and dealing. Adding another facility without addressing these existing problems represents negligent urban planning.
7. **Community Engagement Failures:** When our community expressed concerns about the Mission Cabins development, we were systematically ignored. Despite this, we subsequently worked collaboratively to help maintain clean streets and a safe environment. Our good-faith efforts have not been reciprocated with meaningful inclusion in planning for this significant new development.

Let me be clear: This is NOT opposition to development at 1979 Mission. Rather, we strongly advocate for family housing to be prioritized as the first building constructed at this site. This approach would better serve our neighborhood's needs, complement the nearby elementary school, and help create a more balanced community.

We strongly urge you to:

- Revise the development sequence to prioritize family housing as the first building
- Consider the counterproductive nature of placing addiction recovery services directly above an active drug market
- Implement the equitable distribution initiative for supportive services throughout San Francisco
- Address the existing problems of drug dealing, illegal vending, and unsafe conditions before adding additional services

Our community deserves better than to be treated as a convenient dumping ground for services that other neighborhoods refuse to host. We expect our elected officials to demonstrate the political courage necessary to distribute these vital services equitably throughout the city while prioritizing development that strengthens family-centered community building in the Mission.

I, along with my neighbors, request a prompt response and meaningful dialogue about these concerns.

Concerned resident,
Veronica Garcia

From: [Aaron Wojack](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#): CPC-Commissions Secretary
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lerma, Santiago \(DEM\)](#); [DHSH \(HOM\)](#); [tips@missionlocal.com](#); [tips@sfstandard.com](#); [metrodesk@sfchronicle.com](#); [info@48hills.org](#); [Collins, Jenny \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Addiction treatment housing at 1979 Mission
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 9:55:15 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and City Officials:

I am writing as a concerned resident of the Mission District regarding the proposed development at 1979 Mission Street adjacent to the 16th Street BART plaza and Marshall Elementary School. While our community strongly supports compassionate solutions for those struggling with addiction and mental health challenges, we must express our profound disappointment and frustration with the current plan to replace the Mission Cabins with a facility focused on these services as the first phase of development.

We have learned that construction is slated to begin in December as the first of three buildings planned for this site. Our community strongly urges that family housing be prioritized as the first building constructed at this location, rather than additional addiction and mental health services. I feel compelled to outline several critical concerns about the current approach:

- 1. Direct Conflict with Equitable Distribution:** This development is in direct conflict with current initiatives for the equitable distribution of services throughout San Francisco that are supported by multiple supervisors, including Jackie Fielder. Continuing to concentrate these services in the Mission District while other neighborhoods remain underserved represents poor urban planning and policy inequity.
- 2. Highly Counterproductive to Improving Street Conditions:** Placing a facility for individuals struggling with addiction directly above one of the most notorious drug markets in the Mission is not only counterproductive but likely to worsen existing conditions. This approach threatens both the success of those seeking recovery and the community's ongoing efforts to improve safety and cleanliness in the neighborhood.
- 3. Oversaturation of Similar Services:** The Mission District, particularly this section, already bears a disproportionate burden of supportive services in San Francisco. We ask: Why continue to concentrate these services in an already heavily impacted neighborhood?
- 4. Counterproductive Location for Addiction Recovery:** The proposed site is situated directly adjacent to Capp Street between 16th and 17th Streets—an area notorious for open drug dealing and use. Placing individuals struggling with addiction literally on top of one of the Mission's most entrenched drug markets is not only illogical but potentially harmful to their recovery. This placement defies basic principles of effective rehabilitation.
- 5. Proximity to Marshall Elementary:** The development will be located near a school serving predominantly low-income, Spanish-speaking children who already navigate

challenging environmental conditions. Family housing would complement and support this school community, creating a more cohesive neighborhood environment.

6. **Existing SRO Issues:** Our neighborhood already contains numerous poorly managed SROs that harbor drug use and dealing. Adding another facility without addressing these existing problems represents negligent urban planning.
7. **Community Engagement Failures:** When our community expressed concerns about the Mission Cabins development, we were systematically ignored. Despite this, we subsequently worked collaboratively to help maintain clean streets and a safe environment. Our good-faith efforts have not been reciprocated with meaningful inclusion in planning for this significant new development.

Let me be absolutely clear: This is NOT opposition to development at 1979 Mission. Rather, we strongly advocate for family housing to be prioritized as the first building constructed at this site. This approach would better serve our neighborhood's needs, complement the nearby elementary school, and help create a more balanced community.

We strongly urge you to:

- Revise the development sequence to prioritize family housing as the first building
- Consider the counterproductive nature of placing addiction recovery services directly above an active drug market
- Implement the equitable distribution initiative for supportive services throughout San Francisco
- Address the existing problems of drug dealing, illegal vending, and unsafe conditions before adding additional services

Our community deserves better than to be treated as a convenient dumping ground for services that other neighborhoods refuse to host. We expect our elected officials to demonstrate the political courage necessary to distribute these vital services equitably throughout the city while prioritizing development that strengthens family-centered community building in the Mission.

I, along with my neighbors, request a prompt response and meaningful dialogue about these concerns.

Respectfully but urgently,

Aaron Wojack

Resident and homeowner

3 Capp Street

SF, CA 94103

646-725-4857

From: [G X](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Proposed Development at 1979 Mission Street
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 12:20:16 PM
Attachments: [featured-scaled.png](#)

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

Board,

Please review this URGENT request on behalf of Marshall Elementary school, local residents and businesses near the proposed 1979 Mission housing project

Begin forwarded message:

From: G X <whirlhead@gmail.com>
Date: May 7, 2025 at 11:57:33 AM PDT
To: Daniel Lurie <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Cc: oard.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, santiago.lerma@sfgov.org, jennifer.m.collins@sfgov.org, dhsh@sfgov.org, tips@missionlocal.com, tips@sfsstandard.com, metrodesk@sfcnchronicle.com, info@48hills.org
Subject: RE: Proposed Development at 1979 Mission Street

Dear Mayor Lurie and City Officials:

I am writing as a concerned resident of the Mission District regarding the proposed development at 1979 Mission Street adjacent to the 16th Street BART plaza and Marshall Elementary School. While our community strongly supports compassionate solutions for those struggling with addiction and mental health challenges, we must express our profound disappointment and frustration with the current plan to replace the Mission Cabins with a facility focused on these services as the first phase of development.

We have learned that construction is slated to begin in December as the first of three buildings planned for this site. Our community strongly urges that family housing be prioritized as the first building constructed at this location, rather than additional addiction and mental health services. I feel compelled to outline several critical concerns about the current approach:

- 1. Direct Conflict with Equitable Distribution:** This development is in direct conflict with current initiatives for the equitable distribution of services throughout San Francisco that are supported by multiple supervisors, including Jackie Fielder. Continuing to concentrate these

services in the Mission District while other neighborhoods remain underserved represents poor urban planning and policy inequity.



2. **Highly Counterproductive to Improving Street Conditions:** Placing a facility for individuals struggling with addiction directly above one of the most notorious drug markets in the Mission is not only counterproductive but likely to worsen existing conditions. This approach threatens both the success of those seeking recovery and the community's ongoing efforts to improve safety and cleanliness in the neighborhood.
3. **Oversaturation of Similar Services:** The Mission District, particularly this section, already bears a disproportionate burden of supportive services in San Francisco. We ask: Why continue to concentrate these services in an already heavily impacted neighborhood?
4. **Counterproductive Location for Addiction Recovery:** The proposed site is situated directly adjacent to Capp Street between 16th and 17th Streets—an area notorious for open drug dealing and use. Placing individuals struggling with addiction literally on top of one of the Mission's most entrenched drug markets is not only illogical but potentially harmful to their recovery. This placement defies basic principles of effective rehabilitation.
5. **Proximity to Marshall Elementary:** The development will be located near a school serving predominantly low-income, Spanish-speaking children who already navigate challenging environmental conditions. Family housing would complement and support this school community, creating a more cohesive neighborhood environment.

6. **Existing SRO Issues:** Our neighborhood already contains numerous poorly managed SROs that harbor drug use and dealing. Adding another facility without addressing these existing problems represents negligent urban planning.
7. **Community Engagement Failures:** When our community expressed concerns about the Mission Cabins development, we were systematically ignored. Despite this, we subsequently worked collaboratively to help maintain clean streets and a safe environment. Our good-faith efforts have not been reciprocated with meaningful inclusion in planning for this significant new development.

Let me be absolutely clear: This is NOT opposition to development at 1979 Mission. Rather, we strongly advocate for family housing to be prioritized as the first building constructed at this site. This approach would better serve our neighborhood's needs, complement the nearby elementary school, and help create a more balanced community.

We strongly urge you to:

- Revise the development sequence to prioritize family housing as the first building
- Consider the counterproductive nature of placing addiction recovery services directly above an active drug market
- Implement the equitable distribution initiative for supportive services throughout San Francisco
- Address the existing problems of drug dealing, illegal vending, and unsafe conditions before adding additional services

Our community deserves better than to be treated as a convenient dumping ground for services that other neighborhoods refuse to host. We expect our elected officials to demonstrate the political courage necessary to distribute these vital services equitably throughout the city while prioritizing development that strengthens family-centered community building in the Mission.

I, along with my neighbors, request a prompt response and meaningful dialogue about these concerns.

George, 32 Adair street near Capp and the proposed homeless center

sent from the phone

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: 2 Letters Regarding SFPD Chief Resignation
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 12:08:55 PM
Attachments: [2 Letters Regarding SFPD Chief Resignation.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 2 letters regarding the San Francisco Police Chief's resignation.

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: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station, \(POL\)](#); [Sawyer, Jason \(POL\)](#); [Press Office, Mayor \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPD Chief Scott's Long Overdue Resignation
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 4:14:56 PM

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,

Let us be real about Chief Scott's resignation - it's about goddamn time!

We all know what's been happening in SF. All statistics might look better on paper, but walk down any street and you'll see the truth. Neighborhood stores are still getting hit regularly, homeless encampments are still everywhere, and people are openly using drugs on our sidewalks.

The stats "improvements" we kept on hearing about still don't match what we're actually experiencing, and while the previous administration's incompetence is probably to blame for most of it, Chief Scott is certainly to blame for some of it.

During his tenure, disgraced and incompetent "Chief" Scott participated in the defunding of SFPD, lowered its staffing levels, contributed to low officer morale levels, and most importantly, let 10,000s of theft, crime, riot occurrences happen in our city with no or little police response.

SFPD will likely take years to rebuild, but we now have a chance to get this right.

We need a new Police Chief who will:

- Actually enforce the laws on the books - all of them, including federal law
- Get tough on repeat offenders instead of the revolving door approach
- Build up (Double? Triple?) SFPD's numbers so we have enough officers to cover the city to show criminals there are real consequences to breaking the law, and stand up for public safety even when it's politically difficult.
- Ensure our officers are rebuilding their presence all over town, regularly patrolling all neighborhoods, and walking the beat.

Our city deserves better than the circus we've been getting over the last couple of years.

The next Chief needs to prioritize making San Francisco safe again, not playing politics or making excuses.

This is your chance to make a real difference.

Please choose someone who has the guts to do what's necessary and the leadership skills to make it happen.

Thanks for listening,

<https://sfstandard.com/2025/05/07/police-chief-bill-scott-announces-resignation/>

<https://www.ktvu.com/news/sfpd-bill-scott-la-metro-announcement.amp>

<https://www.kron4.com/news/bay-area/chief-bill-scott-to-leave-sfpd-accept-position-in-another-jurisdiction/amp/>

From: [RichardGB Hylton](#)
To: [Henderson, Paul \(DPA\)](#); [Andrea Guerrero](#); [AB953](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Office of Councilmember Henry Foster](#); [seanelorivera@sandiego.gov](#); [Office of Mayor Todd Gloria](#); [Maunder, Sara \(DPA\)](#); [Jennifer Campbell](#)
Subject: San Francisco emerges as a National Policing Model, and Other Tales Recounted by Fools
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 1:45:55 PM

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

With Mr. Bill's pending departure, from his leadership position in San Francisco, we have the sycophants let loose. This from a Supervisor:

Supervisor Dorsey, who previously served as the SFPD's communications head, tweeted a statement saying, "It was among the great honors of my career to serve in SFPD under SFPD Chief Bill Scott's leadership — through Covid, George Floyd, the recall of a sitting D.A., and an unprecedented staffing crisis — **and watch it emerge as a national model for 21st century police reform.**"

Tell Chuck Wexler to look away.

And here comes overtime again, guarded by the usual bodyguard of lies, led by the understaffing claim. Even this dullard can see through the understaffing claims, understaffing that is deliberately done **in the furtherance of Overtime demands**. Sacrificing staffing, in the interests of accommodating Overtime demands, proved detrimental to the health, wealth and safety of those who live in the fire-ravaged areas of Los Angeles County, and was the undoing of the LAFD's former Chief. Ask her about it.

I rather suspect that the public servants who approve these Overtime things know too.

The departure announcement arrives, coincidentally or not, the day after the Board of Supervisors chastised the SFPD for bringing them a surprise **\$61 million bill for police overtime**, that they begrudgingly voted to pay Tuesday. "I don't think the city should ever be in a situation that requires this much overtime from our public safety agencies," said Supervisor Matt Dorsey, [per Mission Local](#).

Per the Chronicle, Lurie said he would be working with Scott over "roughly the next six weeks" to "ensure a smooth transition," and he said that former SFPD commander Paul Yep, who was recently tapped by Lurie to be his public safety chief in City Hall, would serve as interim SFPD chief until Scott's successor is selected.

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:
Subject: FW: Chief Bill Scott to leave SFPD, accept position in another jurisdiction Re: Data Obtained from DataSF was compared to other sources. Re: Promises Promises Re: Now do the same for Citation and Arrest Data
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 12:44:31 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#) [image.png](#) [image.png](#)

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding the San Francisco Police Chief's resignation.

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: RichardGB Hylton <rhylton749@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 12:40 PM
To: Henderson, Paul (DPA) <paul.henderson@sfgov.org>; Campbell, Christopher (POL) <christopher.r.campbe@sfgov.org>; Ozol, Jonathan (POL) <Jonathan.T.Ozol@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Research.Services@doj.ca.gov; CJIS PRA <CJIS.PRA@doj.ca.gov>; AB953@doj.ca.gov; Police-Practices@DOJ.CA.GOV; SFPD, Commission (POL) <SFPD.Commission@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Andrea Guerrero <andrea@alliancesd.org>; Andrew Keatts <andrew.keatts@axios.com>
Subject: Chief Bill Scott to leave SFPD, accept position in another jurisdiction Re: Data Obtained from DataSF was compared to other sources. Re: Promises Promises Re: Now do the same for Citation and Arrest Data

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

Another SFPD leader makes his way to the exit, and it's about time. [Chief Bill Scott to leave SFPD, accept position in another jurisdiction. Clear the exits.](#)

Perhaps, he will go team up with Glazer, the former Deputy Chief and expert who did not know that San Francisco's stop data was [not](#) being audited and, through his exceptional ignorance created these outrageous shambles.

Ignorance is not disqualifying, neither is incompetence

[Memphis police officers found not guilty of all state charges in Tyre Nichols beating death](#)

But these grinning Memphis goons shall likely go to prison anyway, unless they are pardoned by the expert at economics.

From: RichardGB Hylton
Sent: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 10:15 AM
To: [support@datasf.org](#); [paul.henderson@sfgov.org](#); Campbell, Christopher (POL); Ozol, Jonathan (POL); [Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org](#); Supervisor Records (CAT); [Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org](#)
Cc: [Research.Services@doj.ca.gov](#); CJIS PRA; [AB953@doj.ca.gov](#); [Police-Practices@DOJ.CA.GOV](#); [SFPD.COMMISSION@sfgov.org](#); Somera, Alisa (BOS); [paul.henderson@sfgov.org](#); Andrea Guerrero; Andrew Keatts
Subject: Data Obtained from DataSF was compared to other sources. Re: Promises Promises Re: Now do the same for Citation and Arrest Data

An explanation of what is meant by [Data Integrity Validation](#) may be distilled to: **comparing the data being examined to similar data held in or from other sources**. It is something that I do with RIPA-reported Citations and Arrests; I compare them over a given period to their counterparts that exist in discrete databases. If the results are close, the [overall reported stops](#) are likely valid.

In a communication sent subsequent to the below, I mentioned discovering updated information on the DataSF Open Data website, data covering 292,000 records that now includes records for 2024. I have summarized them using, as a control, CJIS values that were fetched from CJIS Statorily Mandated Tables that are published annually. This is how the summary was prepared and the results of those around 292,000 records:

```

112 1 WITH CTE AS
113 2 (
114 3     SELECT TOP (1000) [Customerid]
115 4     ,[AgencyORI]
116 5     ,[Wave]
117 6     ,[Agency]
118 7     ,[StopRecords]
119 8     ,[StopYear]
120 9     FROM [CJIS].[dbo].[CJIS AnnualStops] WHERE [AgencyORI] = 'CA0380100' ORDER BY STOPYEAR
121 10
122 11
123 12     SELECT COUNT(*) Records,Year([stop_datetime]) Year, [stop_data_record_status] , CTE.StopRecords as [CJIS StopRecords], COUNT(*) - CTE.StopRecords as [Diff]
124 13     FROM [SanFranciscoData] [dbo].[SanFranciscoDataSFStopData]
125 14     INNER JOIN CTE ON CTE.StopYear = Year([stop_datetime])
126 15     GROUP BY [stop_data_record_status],Year([stop_datetime]),CTE.StopRecords
127 16     ORDER BY [stop_data_record_status],Year([stop_datetime])
128 17
129 18     SELECT COUNT(*)Records,[stop_data_record_status] FROM [SanFranciscoData] [dbo].[SanFranciscoDataSFStopData]
130 19     GROUP BY [stop_data_record_status]

```

10 %

Results

Records	Year	stop_data_record_status	CJIS StopRecords	Diff
1	58439	2018	Completed - Successful Submission	56408
2	101649	2019	Completed - Successful Submission	101614
3	27476	2021	Completed - Successful Submission	27453
4	19007	2000	Completed - Successful Submission	18109
5	20555	2023	Completed - Successful Submission	13751
6	488	2018	Deleted	56408
7	591	2019	Deleted	101614
8	78	2021	Deleted	27453
9	88	2022	Deleted	15106
10	36	2023	Deleted	13751
11	164	2018	In progress	56408
12	152	2019	In progress	101614
13	8	2021	In progress	27453
14	36	2022	In progress	15106
15	52	2023	In progress	13751
16	88	2019	No Further Information Available	101614
17	4	2021	No Further Information Available	27453
18	102	2018	Ready for Submission	56408
19	25	2019	Ready for Submission	101614
20	10	2021	Ready for Submission	27453
21	21	2022	Ready for Submission	15106
22	25	2023	Ready for Submission	13751

Neither you nor me should have interest in any of the trivial differences, but should in aged "In-Progress" or "Ready for Submission" items from bygone years. Quite obviously, as I have repeatedly said, more than 6,000 records "Completed-Successful Submission" records were deep-sixed at CA-DOJ

Query executed successfully.

RHYLTONHPTOUCH (15.0 RTM) | RHYLTONHPTOUCH\hylt (57) | master | 00:00:00 | 22 rows

But for the disappearance of 6814 "Completed-Successful Submission" records in 2023, the assertions of diminutions, including disparities, and other cleanliness claims that allowed the SFPD to extricate itself from the CA-DOJ Overseers overlooking things like this, rather "these." I say "these" because data obtained from other sources and these data show hundreds of invalid racial classifications that should not have passed UI validation, and hundreds where race/ethnicity is missing altogether.

I hold and maintain that data produced under the CPRA, data that contains missing and unexplained information (here race/ethnicity) is noncompliant with the CPRA.


Who can one complain to, when both sides are corrupt? Drop me a line, with suggestions.

From: RichardGB Hylton

Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2025 9:54 PM

To: support@datafa.org; paul.henderson@sfgov.org; Campbell, Christopher (POL); Ozol, Jonathan (POL); Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org
Cc: Research.Services@doj.ca.gov; CJIS PRA; AB053@doj.ca.gov; Police-Practices@DOJ.CA.GOV; SFPD.COMMISSION@sfgov.org; Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: Promises Promises Re: Now do the same for Citation and Arrest Data

These are the results of my data download from DataSF. It confirms what I have been complaining about and shall continue to complain about, until the matter is acknowledged and resolved: The almost 6,000 disappeared Stop Records for 2023. At 6,885, the actual number is obviously closer to 7,000. That is one third of the 2023 total and is disgraceful.



```

107 USE [SanFranciscoData]
108
109 SELECT COUNT(*) Records , Year(stop_datetime) Stopdate
110 FROM [SanFranciscoData].[dbo].[SanFranciscoStopData]
111 --GROUP BY Year(stop_datetime)
112 group by rollup( Year(stop_datetime))
113
114

```

110 %

Results

Records	Stopdate	
1	57169	2018
2	102462	2019
3	36799	2020
4	27576	2021
5	15212	2022
6	20638	2023
7	261874	NULL

The 2023 Stop record count (20638) is how a Fabrication becomes a Finding. The California Department of Justice claims that San Francisco reported having only 13,751 records, almost 7000 fewer. Please see my numerous nag Emails about that.

Absent the obvious purging of almost 7,000 San Francisco PD stop records, there could be no [dubious and discretable](#) claim(s) of data and disparity diminution.

I will be more than happy to forward my numerous and obviously annoying communications about The [Disappeared](#) (almost 6,000)

Just ask.

I repeat what I said umpteen times; a fraud has been perpetrated on the USDOJ, and I regret to admit that none deserves it more: "When a thief steals from a thief, the Devil laughs."

These data contain neither Narratives nor Pretext Stop Flags. Contrary to what the DataSF site suggests, there is no 2024 Stop Data there. That is disappointing.

From: RichardGB Hylton

Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2025 2:22 PM

To: support@datasf.org; paul.henderson@sfgov.org; Campbell, Christopher (POL); Ozol, Jonathan (POL)

Subject: Now do the same for Citation and Arrest Data

The LAPD uses software that [from all appearances](#) is identical to what [DataSF uses](#). It took, perhaps a minute to download San Francisco's data (262,000 rows), just as it takes almost less time to do filtered monthly downloads of LAPD's [Stop](#) and [Arrest](#) Data. [Citations](#) are another kettle of fish. I obtained Citations through a CPRA Request, and they proved to be useless, i.e. they were far fewer than were RIPA-reported.

Who reports more Citation records than were written, other than individual cops with quotas.

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: Protect Free Public Courts
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 1:20:58 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding public pickleball and tennis court reservation fees.

Regards,

John Bullock

Office of the Clerk of the Board

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-5184

BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Sean Lee <seanboramlee@icloud.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 1:05 PM

To: Commission, Recpark (REC) <recpark.commission@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS)

<matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Protect Free Public Courts

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

Dear City Council,

I oppose the \$5/hr reservation fee for pickleball and tennis courts.

Free access to public tennis & pickleball courts promotes communal, emotional, and physical well-being by serving as third spaces that foster an opportunity to revitalize the vibrant community in San Francisco.

Limiting access by charging for these courts will slow down the momentum that is currently happening on the free tennis and pickleball courts. This fee would erode the roots of community cohesion that public courts cultivate across our city.

As a taxpayer, voting constituent, and involved member of the community in San Francisco, I urge you to oppose this fee and protect access to our public courts.

Sincerely,

Sean Lee

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: Protect Free Public Courts
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 11:29:30 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding public pickleball and tennis court reservation fees.

Regards,

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

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

-----Original Message-----

From: May Fence <maysfence@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 8, 2025 10:45 AM
To: Commission, Recpark (REC) <recpark.commission@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Protect Free Public Courts

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

Dear City Council,

I oppose the \$5/hr reservation fee for pickleball and tennis courts.

Free access to public tennis & pickleball courts promotes communal, emotional, and physical well-being by serving as third spaces that foster an opportunity to revitalize the vibrant community in San Francisco.

Limiting access by charging for these courts will slow down the momentum that is currently happening on the free tennis and pickleball courts. This fee would erode the roots of community cohesion that public courts cultivate across our city.

As a taxpayer, voting constituent, and involved member of the community in San Francisco, I urge you to oppose this fee and protect access to our public courts.

Sincerely,
May Ng

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: San Francisco Home Owner-Tax Payers
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 4:33:10 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding various subjects.

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: Trvlr <reydingo@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 4:29 PM
To: Mark Reynolds <reydingo@yahoo.com>
Subject: San Francisco Home Owner-Tax Payers

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

it has been 5 Months now and SF residents have not seen much other than picking people (panels, task forces, etc) for jobs to pay in the Administration and more talk talk talk of

homelessness, overdose deaths increasing and crime 'statistics' which mean nothing to crime victims who live here and who visit as tourists.

now, another period of 'learning curve' for new SFPD leadership and their own policies and philosophies and picking their command...all the while crime continues, overdose deaths increase and we still do not feel safe as residents.

'San Francisco's police chief is stepping down. Here's what it means for the city'

'S.F. Police Department's second-in-command, seen as possible future chief, to retire in May'

it is not curious to us why our neighbors have moved outside the city and/or are considering it, along with our Family.

high taxes, high property taxes, restrictive regulations inhibiting remodeling, replacing windows or the most basic home upgrades....

U.S. Veteran and Unaffiliated Voter

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: In support of a citywide No Turn On Red policy
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 9:26:18 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding **File No. 231016:**

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,

John Bullock

Office of the Clerk of the Board

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-5184

BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Greg OConnor <greg@gloconnor.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 8, 2025 9:11 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: In support of a citywide No Turn On Red policy

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing in support of a citywide No Turn On Red policy. As a resident who gets around San Francisco by walking, biking, and driving, I've seen how drivers creeping through crosswalks (or worse, just ignoring other street users because they are focused only on cars) present a daily hazard to me commuting and enjoying my neighborhood.

I live in Hayes Valley and am lucky enough to cycle to work, walk to most amenities, but also drive regularly and own a car. I'm not a car hater, but also it shouldn't feel like a second-class member of the community when I have the audacity to walk to walk around our lovely city.

I hope you'll support this change. It's a small, practical step that improves safety and comfort across the board. Thank you.

Greg OConnor

greg@gloconnor.com

440A GROVE ST

San Francisco, California 94102

<<https://click.actionnetwork.org/ss/o/u001.ZbNyqOfLYPaP-d23SgKjnQ/4gb/QcAdx3QARqGu1zhjsLmCUg/ho.gif>>

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [McHugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: I Support Transparency: Vote to Notify San Franciscans about the Upzoning Plan
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 8:40:54 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding **File No. 241210:**

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to require notice of rezoning intended to comply with Housing Element law; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare pursuant to Planning Code, Section 302.

Regards,

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: Elizabeth Clark <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 6:31 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <ChanStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <MelgarStaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: I Support Transparency: Vote to Notify San Franciscans about the Upzoning Plan

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

Elizabeth Clark

Email

swimeclark@gmail.com

I live in District

I Support Transparency: Vote to Notify San Franciscans about the Upzoning Plan

Message:

Dear Supervisor,

It seems strange that anyone would vote against transparency in government.

I support legislation requiring proper notification of zoning and density changes. Every resident, business owner, and tenant deserves to be informed about major land use decisions that will reshape their neighborhoods.

Major overhauls to zoning laws should not be hidden in places that many residents may never see. People deserve direct notification about significant land use changes affecting their neighborhoods.

The proposed ordinance would provide transparency by requiring mailed notices to all property owners, residents, and business tenants in upzoned areas, as well as those within 300 feet of affected parcels. It is also critical that all public information about these zoning changes includes clear before-and-after images from various angles and distances. Many residents cannot fully grasp the impact of proposed height and density increases from zoning numbers alone—accurate visuals are essential for informed public input.

I urge you to support transparency and vote yes on this notification ordinance.

Sincerely,

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [McHugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: No Cop Tax!! I OPPOSE Safai's amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 9:10:25 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding **File No. 230985:**

Charter Amendment (Third Draft) to amend the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco to define “Full-Duty Sworn Officers” for purposes of establishing minimum staffing levels for sworn officers of the Police Department; and, contingent upon the Controller’s certification that a future tax measure passed by the voters will generate sufficient additional revenue to fund the cost of employing Full-Duty Sworn Officers at specified minimum staffing levels and the minimum amount necessary to implement a police staffing fund: 1) set the Minimum Staffing Number for five fiscal years beginning with 1,700 full-duty sworn officers in year one, with increases each year such that by the fifth fiscal year, the Minimum Staffing Number shall be 2,074; 2) require for a period of five years that the Mayor and Board of Supervisors appropriate funds to pay for at least the number of sworn officers as of February 1 of the prior fiscal year; 3) establish a Police Full Staffing Fund (“Fund”) for a period of five fiscal years to facilitate minimum police staffing; 4) require that \$16.8 million be appropriated into the Fund in the first year, and varying amounts in years two through five, calculated based on staffing shortages, but allowing for a temporary freeze of appropriations to the Fund after the first year in a budgetary or economic emergency; at an election to be held on March 5, 2024.

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: Kenneth Camp <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 6:13 AM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary (BOS) <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>

Subject: No Cop Tax!! I OPPOSE Safai's amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Kenneth Camp, kennycamp@gmail.com

I am a resident of
District 5

Message: No Cop Tax!! I OPPOSE Safai's amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE Supervisor Safai's amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SFPD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be \$20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-SeniorDps; BOS-LegislativeAdvis
Cc: BOS-Council; BOS-LegislativeAdvis
Subject: FW: STOP MAKING LIFE HARDER FOR SAN FRANCISCANS: STOP SFMTA OVER-REACH
Date: Thursday, May 6, 2025 8:37:46 AM

Hello,

Please see the below communication regarding the SFMTA Biking and Rolling Plan.

Regards,

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

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

From: Kyung Choi <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 12:00 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <MelgarStaff@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <ChanStaff@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary (BOS) <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shannan (BOS) <shannan.walton@sfgov.org>
Subject: STOP MAKING LIFE HARDER FOR SAN FRANCISCANS: STOP SFMTA OVER-REACH

This message is 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 Kyung Choi

Email k1a2choi@gmail.com

I live in

Do you want to be notified about opportunities to speak up in person to improve the mobility of all San Franciscans?

No, thanks.

STOP MAKING LIFE HARDER FOR SAN FRANCISCANS: STOP SFMTA OVER-REACH

Message: Dear Supervisors, Mayor, City Attorney and SFMTA,

You work for us. Stop making our lives harder. San Francisco is at a critical juncture. With the SFMTA facing a \$320 million deficit next year, the agency is proposing cuts to essential services like Muni and our iconic Cable Cars—services that generate revenue and are indispensable to our city's daily life and tourism industry. Instead of cutting these core services, SFMTA leadership should focus on trimming administrative costs and unnecessary "Streets" projects, including the ill-conceived Biking and Rolling Plan.

The Biking and Rolling Plan is an unvetted, non-transparent proposal that lacks meaningful community input. Its sweeping changes to San Francisco's streets—many slated for implementation within the next five years—are poorly explained, lack environmental impact studies, and will severely restrict mobility for residents and visitors alike. This plan prioritizes niche interests over the broader public good, undermining San Francisco's recovery at a time when we can least afford it.

For instance, the draft plan linked below illustrates the confusion and lack of clarity surrounding these proposals. View the SFMTA Biking and Rolling Plan: <https://url.yanran.click/v2/017/> https://www.sfmta.com/media/41116/download?inline..._YXAx-OrNn2zHQyOm6zqzNDNk2zTRMGMjM2c4YWRlzbhIMTUzD02zTzFnTzL2NeOjQjkkzG6QGz2mMDbz7dmNTY02DVNmNlNgzNmNkMGU4YzgwZDc4Njk3YT1zD0NlMzQwNzUzZGQwZmU1YmNlYz3ODhJZTp0QlQ6Tg

On page 59, proposals for Chain of Lakes Drive and the Great Highway between Fulton and Lincoln are unclear. Are these roads going car-free, or not? The answer is obscured by conflicting options and ambiguous maps (see page 64). How is the public supposed to understand, let alone provide feedback on, proposals presented in this manner? Why has SFMTA failed to adequately publicize these changes or consult with voters?

We demand transparency. San Francisco residents deserve to know what's being planned for their streets, and any major changes should be discussed with voters before implementation, not sprung upon the community after the fact.

Additionally, these proposals would drastically reduce—or outright eliminate—car access on streets like Chain of Lakes Drive, further discouraging tourism and limiting mobility. San Francisco's economic recovery hinges on accessibility for all—residents, tourists, and commuters from the North and South Bay. Road closures and road diets undermine this effort.

Adding to the uncertainty, Senator Scott Wiener's recent legislation advocates for transit- and HOV-only lanes on 19th Avenue. Reducing automobile capacity on this critical artery by nearly one-third will create massive gridlock, deter visitors, and lead to increased vehicle emissions from congestion. The potential ripple effects on local businesses, museums, restaurants, and cultural venues could be devastating.

Learn more about Senator Wiener's street safety package

At a minimum, no changes proposed in the Biking and Rolling Plan should even be considered until the 19th Avenue repaving project is complete.

The SFMTA must refocus on its core mission: public transit. Vanity projects that cater to a narrow interest group should not take precedence over the needs of the city at large. San Francisco residents and businesses demand accountability and transparency from both the SFMTA and SFCTA. We urge our elected officials to protect the freedom of mobility for all—residents, visitors, and commuters alike.

Please act to stop the SFMTA from implementing further road closures or capacity reductions without robust public input and a clear assessment of the economic and environmental impacts. Our city's future depends on it.

Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter.

Sincerely,

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: Oppose the Oak Street Quick Build
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 8:49:47 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding the San Francisco Municipal Transit Agency (SFMTA) Oak Street Quick-Build Project.

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: Michael Dorf <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 4, 2025 5:34 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <MelgarStaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <ChanStaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Oppose the Oak Street Quick Build

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors,
Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent

Michael Dorf

Email

michael_dorf@comcast.net

Subject

Oppose the Oak Street Quick Build

Message:

Dear SFMTA Board,

Don't thwart San Francisco's recovery! As a taxpaying resident of San Francisco I urge you to vote against implementing the ill-conceived Oak Street Quick Build Project. The last thing San Francisco needs is more congestion and confusion on our roads.

The project proposal page published by SFMTA also lacks transparency. It does not state that if this project does get approved it will eliminate an automobile lane, taking this major SF artery from 4 to 3 lanes between Stanyan St and Ashbury St.

Like other recent proposals that include reducing an automobile lane there is no cost benefit analysis and no data that clearly illustrates to the public the impact of this change. There is no analysis of how much longer it will take to get from Point A to Point B on Oak Street. There is no analysis of what benefit the city gets from doing this project.

Of major importance here, there is already a bike/multi-use path adjacent to the new proposed bike lane that is included in the Oak Street Quick Build proposal. And, one street to the south, Page Street features bike lanes. This is an ideological and dangerous concept, not a sensible, resident-focused, functional city plan.

As you might be aware, closing automobile lanes has led to increased disruption and traffic congestion on streets all over San Francisco - unnecessarily making life harder for the people who live here. Please do the job of exercising real oversight and stand up for residents of San Francisco.

I kindly encourage you to please vote against the implementation of the Oak Street Quick Build Project. The public believes the fix is in and you will vote to approve this because of close connections with the bike coalition, prove us wrong, prove that you will stand up for regular San Franciscans. Otherwise you will continue to lose trust.

Kind regards,

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Subject: Opposition to FILE NO. 250466 Resolution Supporting AB 255 (Haney)...
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 12:36:48 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding **File No. 250466**:

Resolution supporting California State Assembly Bill No. 255, introduced by Assembly Member Matt Haney, The Supportive-Recovery Residence Program, to enable state investment and establish a certification process for such programs.

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: Christopher Mika <mika.christopher@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 9:31 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: 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>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>
Subject: Subject: Opposition to FILE NO. 250466 Resolution Supporting AB 255 (Haney)...

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

Dear Supervisors,,

I'm writing to urge you to vote no on Supervisor Dorsey's resolution supporting Assembly Bill 255 (Haney) regarding the establishment of a state-supported Supportive-Recovery Residence (SRR) program.

While I understand that AB 255 has been amended in response to public feedback, significant and unresolved concerns remain. Major national and statewide housing organizations—including the Corporation for Supportive Housing, Housing California, and the National Alliance to End Homelessness—have raised objections to the bill as written, particularly in its alignment with the Housing First model.

Specifically:

- 1.
- 2.
3. **Eviction**
4. **Loophole via “Automatic” Language:**
5. The bill currently
6. states that relapse is “not an automatic cause for eviction.” This language is a major step backward from earlier language that stated relapse is “not a cause for eviction.” The addition of “automatic” appears to intentionally create a loophole through which
7. tenants could still be evicted for relapse—an ordinary part of recovery. This contradicts both the spirit and practice of Housing First, which decouples housing access from clinical compliance.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
- 12.
13. **Lack**

14. of Evidence for Solving Homelessness:

15. While abstinence-based
16. recovery housing can serve individuals in recovery, there is no evidence that SRRs are an effective intervention for ending homelessness. In fact, research suggests the opposite. Redirecting as much as 25% of homelessness funds to a model that has not demonstrated
17. efficacy in reducing long-term homelessness risks undermining more effective, evidence-based housing approaches.

18.

19.

20.

21.

22.

23. Need

24. for Stronger Safeguards and Data Collection:

25. If SRRs are
26. to be state-funded, then at minimum the bill should mandate robust data collection.
This includes:

27.

-
-
- Tracking evictions
- and the housing outcomes that follow (e.g., whether individuals are rehoused or rendered homeless).
-
-
-
- Vacancy rates, to
- assess true demand.
-
-
-
- Engagement with people
- who have lived experience of homelessness and substance use.
-
-
-

28.

29.

30. **Equity**

31. **and Choice:**

32. True recovery

33. must be rooted in voluntary participation. There must be safeguards to ensure that SRRs are not used to coercively shift people out of Housing First placements or to justify eviction due to relapse or behavior that would be tolerated in other housing settings.

34.

Redirecting public housing dollars to treatment programs violates the core purpose of these funds. These dollars are meant to provide housing, not to fund treatment models that have no demonstrated effectiveness at ending homelessness. AB 255, as written, risks entrenching exclusionary practices and reframing supportive housing as a privilege contingent on compliance rather than a right.

This resolution may be non-binding, but it plays a critical rhetorical role. Supervisor Dorsey is laying the groundwork for a political narrative that misrepresents and undermines Permanent Supportive Housing by portraying it as unsafe or unaccountable. In reality, PSH is simply housing—just like any other apartment in San Francisco—with proven outcomes in reducing homelessness. In San Francisco, the push toward abstinence-based alternatives is being driven by the Salvation Army, a Christian nationalist organization whose ideological agenda is incompatible with harm reduction and housing-first principles. This resolution seeks to redirect public resources away from permanent housing and into the coffers of a religious provider—despite no evidence that their programs improve housing outcomes. The goal is not to support an alternative model; it is to discredit and defund the one that works. This narrative must be actively contested, and this resolution should be rejected.

Please vote no on Supervisor Dorsey's Resolution Supporting Assembly Bill 255 (Haney), titled "The Supportive-Recovery Residence Program," when it comes before the Board.

Sincerely,

Christopher Mika
District 5

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Finance](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Support Letter
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:35:39 AM
Attachments: [SCarpenters25050216590.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached regarding **File No. 250442:**

Motion approving/rejecting the Mayor's nomination for the appointment of Dan Calamuci to the Building Inspection Commission, for a term ending July 1, 2027.

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: Imelda Rangel <irangel@local22.org>
Sent: Friday, May 2, 2025 4:38 PM
To: Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Sean McGarry <SMcgarry@nccrc.org>
Subject: Support Letter

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

sources.

My apologies. Here is the correct support letter.

Thanks,

Imelda Rangel

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject:Message from Carpenters Local #22

Date:Fri, 02 May 2025 16:59:52 -0700

From:scanner@nccrc.org

Reply-To:scanner@nccrc.org

To:irangel@local22.org



United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America

LOCAL UNION NO. 22

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Rules Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA. 94102

VIA EMAIL: Victor.Young@sfgov.org, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Item 1. Support for Dan Calamuci's Nomination to the San Francisco Building Inspection Commission

Chair Walton, Supervisor Mandelman & Supervisor Sherrill:

On behalf of the members of Carpenters Local Union No. 22, representing thousands of workers and their families in San Francisco, I write in strong support of Dan Calamuci's nomination for a seat on the San Francisco Building Inspection Commission.

Dan is a San Francisco resident and has worked for the Nor Cal Carpenters Union for nearly 18 years. He is the Senior Representative for Strategic Campaigns & Research, building and leading a team that is at the forefront of our union's efforts to secure work opportunities for our members, leveling the playing field for contractors, and raising labor standards for all workers. He has earned the respect of his peers and the members we represent and has been elected multiple times by the members of Local 22 to serve as a delegate to our union's governing body.

Dan brings to all roles a passion for service, for raising standards for working people, and for ensuring San Francisco's construction industry meets the needs and demands of workers, contractors, and the public. I am confident he will bring those skills and passions to the Building Inspection Commission and will serve the people of San Francisco with the same honesty and integrity he brings to his work with our union and our membership. He has our union's full support.

Please do not hesitate to reach out with any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Sean McGarry".

Sean McGarry
Senior Field Representative

SM/ir
opeiu29/afl-cio

2085 3RD STREET • SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107
TELEPHONE: (415) 355-1322 • FAX: (415) 355-1422



From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: May 6, 2025 Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 12:35:14 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding **File No. 250339:**

Resolution approving Amendment No. 2 to the agreement between the City, acting by and through, the Department of Public Health (DPH), and HealthRight 360, to provide substance abuse and mental health services, to extend the term by three years from June 30, 2025, for a new term of July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2028, and to increase the amount by \$141,427,165 for a new total not to exceed amount of \$305,358,044; and to authorize DPH to enter into amendments or modifications to the agreement that do not materially increase the obligations or liabilities to the City and are necessary to effectuate the purposes of the agreement or this Resolution.

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: Francine Lofrano <ftblote@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Sunday, May 4, 2025 10:33 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: May 6, 2025 Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors

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

I am writing to submit public comment on agenda item #10 on the Board of Supervisor's regular meeting agenda, May 6, 2025. This agenda item seeks to approve a contract extension and to dump *even more millions of taxpayer dollars* into HealthRight 360's bottomless pit services for mental health and substance abuse. This hasn't worked, it's not working, and it will never work! The City has proven to be unfit fiduciaries of taxpayer money. We have all been watching an endless re-run of waste, failures, broken promises and both government & NGO unaccountability for decades. I am completely opposed to this abject abuse and continued waste of taxpayer money. I urge all the supervisors to vote NOT to approve or adopt this resolution. Enough!

Sincerely,
Francine Lofrano

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 2 Letters Regarding File No. 250190
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 12:39:53 PM
Attachments: [2 Letters Regarding File No. 250190.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 2 letters regarding **File No. 250190:**

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the long-term remission of substance use disorders for individuals as the primary goal of the City's substance use disorder treatment policy.

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: [Jaime Ballew Zerbe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Letter in support of Supervisor Dorsey's Recovery First Language
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 9:08:07 AM
Attachments: [advisory board-SF-2.pdf](#)

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

Hello,

Please find attached a letter in support of Supervisor Dorsey's Recovery First language signed by leaders and members of the FDPS team. We would humbly request for this to be a part of the official record surrounding the debate of this language.

Please let me know if you have any questions or are unable to read the document.

Thank you!

Jaime Ballew Zerbe
Chief of Staff
Smart Approaches to Marijuana
Foundation for Drug Policy Solutions
(540) 849-0107

6 May 2025

Supervisor Dorsey,

On behalf of the Leadership Council of the Foundation for Drug Policy Solutions (FDPS), a non-partisan organization that advocates for a health-first approach to drug policy, we write in support of your “Recovery First” ordinance. We concur that the “Recovery First” vision will “provide needed aspirational policy direction” and that it would offer “a clear and unifying North Star for the new and unique challenges we face in the era of synthetic drugs,” as you outlined.

San Francisco has been facing an unrelenting drug crisis. The [overdose death rate](#) in San Francisco has increased from a rate of 80.2 per 100,000 in 2020 to 99.5 per 100,000 in 2023. Among Black individuals in the city, the rate increased from 403.2 to 606.1 per 100,000. It is evident that a new approach is needed—too many Americans are needlessly dying from drugs.

San Francisco’s approach to drug policy must be grounded in evidence and feature recovery as a central pillar. A recent editorial in the *New England Journal of Medicine* by John Kelly, Nora Volkow, and Howard Koh noted that “a growing array of highly cost-effective, community-based recovery-support services in the United States is helping to catalyze and [sustain long-term healing](#),” concluding that the incorporation of recovery-support services into the traditional treatment infrastructure “could help reduce people’s susceptibility to SUD recurrence...and increase the odds that some of the most vulnerable members of society will not only survive, but ultimately thrive.” The nation’s response to the drug crisis is evolving by placing treatment and recovery at the forefront, and San Francisco has the opportunity to be a leader in this movement.

Similar to your point that “the logical implication of prioritizing an objective as ‘primary’ reasonably suggests other objectives that may be secondary, tertiary, and otherwise subsequent,” officials must not forget about the other central tenets of drug policy, including prevention, treatment, harm reduction, and supply reduction. The “Recovery First” ordinance will serve to orient the city’s services toward helping people currently experiencing addiction to achieve recovery, while continuing to prevent use, reduce harm, and disrupt the illicit market.

The millions of Americans in recovery provide hope to those currently experiencing substance use disorder and demonstrate that it can be overcome. It is our position that the “Recovery First” ordinance will help more San Franciscans to achieve recovery and ultimately live healthy, drug-free lives.

Sincerely,

Kevin A. Sabet
Co-Founder and CEO, Foundation for Drug Policy Solutions

Luke Niforatos

Co-Founder and EVP, Foundation for Drug Policy Solutions

Tom Wolf

Director, West Coast Initiatives, Foundation for Drug Policy Solutions

Thomas Mutryn

Foundation for Drug Policy Solutions Board Member

James William Down

Foundation for Drug Policy Solutions Leadership Council

Marc J. Bern

Smart Approaches to Marijuana Board Member

From: [Adrian Covert](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support (Recovery Ordinance)
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 6:56:06 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[DorseySupport.pdf](#)

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

Greetings Clerk of the Board,

Please see the attached letter of support for supervisor Dorsey's recovery ordinance from the Bay Area Council.
Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

Adrian Covert

Adrian Covert

Senior Vice President, Public Policy

Phone: 415-519-9141 | Email: acovert@bayareacouncil.org

The Historic Klamath, Pier 9, The Embarcadero, San Francisco

www.bayareacouncil.org





May 5, 2025

The Honorable Matt Dorsey
Supervisor
City & County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Dr.
San Francisco, CA

Re: Recovery First Ordinance

Dear Supervisor Dorsey,

Thank you for introducing legislation to prioritize long-term remission from Substance Use Disorder as San Francisco's primary addiction treatment goal. For too long, San Francisco has been seen as a symbol of addiction and despair when it can—and should—instead become a symbol of health and recovery.

Since 2011, overdose deaths among homeless Californians have increased a tragic and inexcusable 488 percent. By some estimates, drug overdose claims the lives of two San Franciscans every day. San Francisco cannot maintain its reputation as a world class city—for people, workers, tourism, and business—with such despair on our streets. That's why the Bay Area Council is co-sponsoring legislation—AB 255 (Haney)—with Mayor Daniel Lurie and the Salvation Army to allow existing state homeless housing programs to support permanent drug-free housing. This ordinance is consistent with efforts at the state level to elevate the importance of supporting recovery from substance use disorder wherever possible as an urgent humanitarian, moral, and economic necessity.

By enshrining recovery as official city policy, this ordinance ensures all city agencies are rowing in the same direction to achieve the same goal. For that reason, the Bay Area Council is happy to support this legislation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jim Wunderman".

Jim Wunderman
President & CEO
Bay Area Council

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 25 Letters Regarding File No. 250131
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 1:29:18 PM
Attachments: [25 Letters Regarding File No. 250131.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 25 letters regarding **File No. 250131:**

Hearing to assess staffing levels and needs within the District Attorney's Office, including an evaluation of the department's capacity to expand in coordination with other public safety agencies, the resources necessary for full implementation of Proposition 36 as well any other resource gaps, challenges related to recruitment and retention, recommending any legislative or budgetary actions to support these efforts; and requesting the District Attorney's Office to report.

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: [Leslie Mullin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reject the DA's \$19.8M expansion request
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 10:16:30 AM

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

Subject: Reject the DA's \$19.8M Expansion Request

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Leslie Mullin, and I am writing as a resident of San Francisco District 1 to express my strong opposition to the District Attorney's request for \$19.8 million in additional funding.

At a time when our city faces a massive budget crisis—and programs that serve our most vulnerable residents are facing cuts—it is unconscionable to approve such a dramatic expansion of a carceral institution. The DA's request is based on speculative arrest data and is not grounded in any clear public safety outcomes.

The Public Defender's Office continues to operate with only 60% of the DA's budget, placing due process in jeopardy. Meanwhile, community-based alternatives like pretrial diversion, treatment, and restorative justice remain underfunded.

The DA is misusing important reforms like Prop 36 and the Racial Justice Act to justify this expansion. But other counties have figured out how to implement these reforms without multimillion-dollar budget increases. What's needed is a change in approach—not more tech, staff, or unchecked power.

I urge you to embrace fiscal responsibility and equity as, require transparency and outcomes tracking of our city departments, and instead invest in programs that stabilize and support our communities—not punish them.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mullin

6626 Fulton St

SF 94121

From: [Dawn Kwan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reject the DA's \$19.8M Expansion Request
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 10:40:46 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Dawn Kwan, and I am writing as a resident of San Francisco to express my strong opposition to the District Attorney's request for \$19.8 million in additional funding.

At a time when our city faces a massive budget crisis—and programs that serve our most vulnerable residents are facing cuts—it is unconscionable to approve such a dramatic expansion of a carceral institution. The DA's request is based on speculative arrest data and is not grounded in any clear public safety outcomes.

The Public Defender's Office continues to operate with only 60% of the DA's budget, placing due process in jeopardy. Meanwhile, community-based alternatives like pretrial diversion, treatment, and restorative justice remain underfunded.

The DA is misusing important reforms like Prop 36 and the Racial Justice Act to justify this expansion. But other counties have figured out how to implement these reforms without multimillion-dollar budget increases. What's needed is a change in approach—not more tech, staff, or unchecked power.

I urge you to embrace fiscal responsibility and equity as, require transparency and outcomes tracking of our city departments, and instead invest in programs that stabilize and support our communities—not punish them.

Dawn

From: [Frank Noto](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: We support the DA's proposed budget
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 4:19:41 PM

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

Honorable Supervisors,

On behalf of Stop Crime Action, we urge you to support the DA's proposed budget. San Francisco has dramatically reduced crime over the last 18 months, and we need to continue our good work and not go backward.

The DA's office has played a critical role in the reduction in crime rates in our city, which benefits our residents as well as our business community and workers. By investing in effective prosecution, we assist San Francisco's economic recovery and thus generate additional tax revenue necessary to pay for other essential local government services.

Planning for additional staffing in light of the passage of Proposition 36 is particularly important. Staffing is also key to avoiding prolonged delays which are agonizing for victims and their families.

Now is not the time to end our progress. We cannot afford to fire prosecutors by cutting the DA's staffing. Let's march forward on public safety, not backwards.

Frank Noto
Stop Crime Action

From: [Kent Lindstrom](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please do not cut Any DA Office Members or Police
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 5:05:11 PM

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

Please note:

- District Attorney Brooke Jenkins' Office has played a critical role in reducing crime to a 20 year low. (The homicide rate last year was the lowest since the 1960s!) Crime dropped 28% last year because prosecutors are doing their jobs.
- Now is not the time to end our progress. We cannot afford to fire prosecutors by cutting the DA's staffing. Let's not march backwards on public safety.
- By investing in effective prosecution, we assist in our economic recovery and thus generate additional tax revenue necessary to pay for other essential local government services.
- "Justice delayed is justice denied," and it is not fair to delay cases, prolonging the agony for victims and their families

- Kent Lindstrom (Mission District)

From: [Arnold Cohn](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RESTORE FUNDING FOR THE DA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 5:08:12 PM

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

Members:

OPPOSE plans to reduce DA Office funding, which could force the firing of prosecutors necessary to protect us against crime:

- District Attorney Brooke Jenkins' Office has played a critical role in reducing crime to a 20 year low. (The homicide rate last year was the lowest since the 1960s!) Crime dropped 28% last year because prosecutors are doing their jobs.
- Now is not the time to end our progress. We cannot afford to fire prosecutors by cutting the DA's staffing. Let's not march backwards on public safety.
- By investing in effective prosecution, we assist in our economic recovery and thus generate additional tax revenue necessary to pay for other essential local government services.
- "Justice delayed is justice denied," and it is not fair to delay cases, prolonging the agony for victims and their families.

Sincerely,

Arnold Cohn

From: [Robert Mansfield](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: District Attorney Budget
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 5:13:27 PM

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

I strongly urge you to oppose reducing the budget for the DA's office. DA Jenkins and her staff have done a great job in making San Francisco safer and they need to continue in that work, not be thwarted by reduced effort.

Robert Mansfield
2 Townsend Street
San Francisco CA 94107

From: [kristen fenech](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [SherrillStaff](#)
Subject: Funding DA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 5:19:55 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please do not cut any funding for the DA's office - I'm a 38 year resident, a nurse here in SF, endured the last 5 terrible years for this city, and have had some hope restored in the last year that the city is serious about keeping citizens safe and attempting to tackle the crime and drug disaster in earnest. Safety is the most importantly issue for residents...this should be obvious by now!

Please find other nonessential Programs to cut. The citizens who are left paying taxes deserve the basics including a staffed DA's office.

Thanks
Kristen Fenech
1200 Gough

From: [John Grauel](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: DA Funding
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 5:27:50 PM

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

Hello Supervisors,

I ask you to support the District Attorney and provide more funds to her office.

Thanks.

J

John Grauel
john@carbonrose.com
650-678-8040

From: danolley@aol.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please restore funding for the DA's office
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 5:48:35 PM

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

District Attorney Brooke Jenkins' Office has played a critical role in reducing crime to a 20 year low. (The homicide rate last year was the lowest since the 1960s!) Crime dropped 28% last year because prosecutors are doing their jobs.

- Now is not the time to end our progress. We cannot afford to fire prosecutors by cutting the DA's staffing. Let's not march backwards on public safety.
- By investing in effective prosecution, we assist in our economic recovery and thus generate additional tax revenue necessary to pay for other essential local government services.
- "Justice delayed is justice denied," and it is not fair to delay cases, prolonging the agony for victims and their families.

Thank you in advance, David Nolley and Nancy Zajac since 1984, District 4

From: [Karim](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Restore funding for the DA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 6:09:07 PM

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

Hello,

- District Attorney Brooke Jenkins' Office has played a critical role in reducing crime to a 20 year low. (The homicide rate last year was the lowest since the 1960s!) Crime dropped 28% last year because prosecutors are doing their jobs.
- Now is not the time to end our progress. We cannot afford to fire prosecutors by cutting the DA's staffing. Let's not march backwards on public safety.
- By investing in effective prosecution, we assist in our economic recovery and thus generate additional tax revenue necessary to pay for other essential local government services.
- "Justice delayed is justice denied," and it is not fair to delay cases, prolonging the agony for victims and their families.

Please restore funding for the DA!

Thank you

Karim ElKatca
SF resident and property owner

From: [matt ball](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Do NOT reduce funding!
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 6:37:23 PM

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

DO NOT reduce funding to the DA's office!

- District Attorney Brooke Jenkins' Office has played a critical role in reducing crime to a 20 year low. (The homicide rate last year was the lowest since the 1960s!) Crime dropped 28% last year because prosecutors are doing their jobs.
- Now is not the time to end our progress. We cannot afford to fire prosecutors by cutting the DA's staffing. Let's not march backwards on public safety.
- By investing in effective prosecution, we assist in our economic recovery and thus generate additional tax revenue necessary to pay for other essential local government services.
- "Justice delayed is justice denied," and it is not fair to delay cases, prolonging the agony for victims and their families.

Matt Ball
San Francisco District 5

From: [Tami Epstein](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Funding for the DA's office
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 7:23:56 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a voting SF resident. I ask you to do what myself and the majority of SF voters asked for when we recalled Chesa Boudin and most recently when we voted for a new Mayor. We showed up and showed out for candidates who put fixing the growing crime problem in this city first on their agenda. Therefore, it is imperative that you listen to the voters and restore funding to DA Jenkins office.

Respectfully,

Tami Epstein

From: [Deena Abramson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Subject: Reject the DA's \$19.8M Expansion Request
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 7:34:41 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Deena Abramson, a long-time San Francisco resident and licensed clinical social worker. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the District Attorney's request for \$19.8 million in additional funding.

At a time when our city faces a massive budget crisis—and programs that serve our most vulnerable residents are facing cuts—it is unconscionable to approve such a dramatic expansion of a carceral institution. The DA's request is based on speculative arrest data and is not grounded in any clear public safety outcomes.

The Public Defender's Office continues to operate with only 60% of the DA's budget, placing due process in jeopardy. Meanwhile, community-based alternatives like pretrial diversion, treatment, and restorative justice remain underfunded.

The DA is misusing important reforms like Prop 36 and the Racial Justice Act to justify this expansion. But other counties have figured out how to implement these reforms without multimillion-dollar budget increases. What's needed is a change in approach—not more tech, staff, or unchecked power.

I urge you to embrace fiscal responsibility and equity as, require transparency and outcomes tracking of our city departments, and instead invest in programs that stabilize and support our communities—not punish them.

Thank you,
Deena Abramson

From: [ALICE XAVER](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Restore funding for the DA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 8:01:00 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

DA Brooke Jenkins has done an excellent job. We finally have someone who is prosecuting criminals. Crime has gone down!
We oppose plans to reduce the District Attorney's office funding. Without sufficient prosecutors, the criminals walk free.

Sincerely,
Alice K Chris Xavier
D7

From: [rpl](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: DA Office Funding
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 8:18:44 PM

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

BoS-

DO NOT reduce DA Office funding, which could force the firing of prosecutors necessary to protect us against crime. SF desperately needs law and order!

Raj Lathigara
District 6 Resident and Small Business Owner

From: [Max](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reject the DA's \$19.8M Expansion Plan
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 9:09:22 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Mad, and I am writing as a resident of San Francisco to express my strong opposition to the District Attorney's request for \$19.8 million in additional funding.

At a time when our city faces a massive budget crisis—and programs that serve our most vulnerable residents are facing cuts—it is unconscionable to approve such a dramatic expansion of a carceral institution. The DA's request is based on speculative arrest data and is not grounded in any clear public safety outcomes.

The Public Defender's Office continues to operate with only 60% of the DA's budget, placing due process in jeopardy. Meanwhile, community-based alternatives like pretrial diversion, treatment, and restorative justice remain underfunded.

The DA is misusing important reforms like Prop 36 and the Racial Justice Act to justify this expansion. But other counties have figured out how to implement these reforms without multimillion-dollar budget increases. What's needed is a change in approach—not more tech, staff, or unchecked power.

I urge you to embrace fiscal responsibility and equity as, require transparency and outcomes tracking of our city departments, and instead invest in programs that stabilize and support our communities—not punish them.

Thank you in advance,
Max

From: [Jeff Jurow](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: DA Funding
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 9:18:58 PM

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

Please do not cut funding for the district attorney's office. We are finally making progress. Let's not go backwards.

Jeff Jurow

From: [Mads Ha](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reject the DA's \$19.8M Expansion Request
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 9:32:12 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Mads, and I am writing as a resident of San Francisco to express my strong opposition to the District Attorney's request for \$19.8 million in additional funding.

At a time when our city faces a massive budget crisis—and programs that serve our most vulnerable residents are facing cuts—it is unconscionable to approve such a dramatic expansion of a carceral institution. The DA's request is based on speculative arrest data and is not grounded in any clear public safety outcomes.

The Public Defender's Office continues to operate with only 60% of the DA's budget, placing due process in jeopardy. Meanwhile, community-based alternatives like pretrial diversion, treatment, and restorative justice remain underfunded.

The DA is misusing important reforms like Prop 36 and the Racial Justice Act to justify this expansion. But other counties have figured out how to implement these reforms without multimillion-dollar budget increases. What's needed is a change in approach—not more tech, staff, or unchecked power.

I urge you to embrace fiscal responsibility and equity as, require transparency and outcomes tracking of our city departments, and instead invest in programs that stabilize and support our communities—not punish them.

From: [Lesley N.](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Don't fire DA's
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 10:19:46 PM

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

We are in Europe now, people walk the streets without fear, the shops are full of goods(not behind glass)very few empty store fronts, as a female I feel safe day and night. The streets are clean! Almost no scary people walking around screaming and stealing. When did this become ok?

Look at yourselves BOFS! Where do you spend our money??

In SF I don't go out at night(no female one I know does)and often fear walking during the day. I have lived in SF since 1990, it wasn't always this way.

Enforce our laws, stop making excuses for people breaking the law. Do NOT defund anything related to our laws or the DA.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Robert Gease](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 8:37:36 AM

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

District Attorney Brooke Jenkins' Office has played a critical role in reducing crime to a 20 year low. (The homicide rate last year was the lowest since the 1960s!) Crime dropped 28% last year because prosecutors are doing their jobs.

Now is not the time to end our progress. We cannot afford to fire prosecutors by cutting the DA's staffing. Let's not march backwards on public safety.

By investing in effective prosecution, we assist in our economic recovery and thus generate additional tax revenue necessary to pay for other essential local government services.

"Justice delayed is justice denied," and it is not fair to delay cases, prolonging the agony for victims and their families.

Robert Gease
District 7

From: kenvanos@yahoo.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Do not defund the DA office
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 8:57:30 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

We all experienced the disaster following the defund the police. Do not make the same mistake. Or be voted out like the former mayor.

Regards,
Ken Vanos

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

From: [Ryan Maher](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reject the DA's \$19.8M Expansion Request
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 10:13:44 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Ryan Maher, and I am writing as a resident of District 4 to express my strong opposition to the District Attorney's request for \$19.8 million in additional funding.

At a time when our city faces a massive budget crisis—and programs that serve our most vulnerable residents are facing cuts—it is unconscionable to approve such a dramatic expansion of the city's incarceration apparatus. The DA's request is based on speculative arrest data and is not grounded in any clear public safety outcomes.

The Public Defender's Office continues to operate with only 60% of the DA's budget, placing due process in jeopardy. Meanwhile, promising community-based alternatives like pretrial diversion, treatment, and restorative justice – which actively rehabilitate people into their communities and restore victims and are much more cost-effective than maintaining jail populations – remain underfunded.

The DA is misusing important reforms like Prop 36 and the Racial Justice Act to justify this expansion. But other counties have figured out how to implement these reforms without multimillion-dollar budget increases. What's needed is a change in approach—not more tech, staff, or unchecked power.

I urge you to embrace fiscal responsibility and equity, require transparency and outcomes tracking of our city departments, and instead invest in programs that stabilize and support our communities—not punish them.

Ryan Maher
Resident of District 4
San Francisco

From: [Adam Epstein](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Restore Funding for the DA
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 11:18:44 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

District Attorney Brooke Jenkins' Office has played a critical role in reducing crime to a 20 year low. (The homicide rate last year was the lowest since the 1960s!) Crime dropped 28% last year because prosecutors are doing their jobs. Now is not the time to end our progress. We cannot afford to fire prosecutors by cutting the DA's staffing. Let's not march backwards on public safety. By investing in effective prosecution, we assist in our economic recovery and thus generate additional tax revenue necessary to pay for other essential local government services. "Justice delayed is justice denied," and it is not fair to delay cases, prolonging the agony for victims and their families.

Regards,
Adam Epstein

From: ifilefire4u@aol.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Cutting the DA's budget when the city is finally getting back on its feet would be foolish
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 12:09:35 PM

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

Crime has kept tourism away from San Francisco and reduced our tax dollars immensely. People who are born and raised in the city are fed up of the crime and left...leaving only renters who don't care what happens because they don't own a piece of the city.

Playing dangerous politics at this time would be a step backwards that we cannot afford. Please do not cut the District Attorney's budget or lay off any staffers there. If anything, as a retired San Francisco firefighter and friend of many police officers I would even agree to blacking out a fire station before cutting the District Attorney's budget.

The real dollars are wasted on repeat offending drug addicts and borderline insane people walking our streets. Compassion goes only so far. If someone doesn't want help why is it our city's responsibility to enable them? Send them back to where they came. Let the small town criminal justice system in their home state deal with the problem they created.

Good luck to you and your decisions going forward. Please don't make the same mistakes twice.

San Francisco Native
Charles Farrugia
283 Gambier St.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: [Crowder, Dona](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: DA office budget for adequate staffing- Budget Committee -250131
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 1:17:23 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

I am speaking to ask that you afford adequate staffing to the DA's office in light of the fact that the District Attorney is most responsible for holding law breakers accountable. With safety issues clearly among the highest priorities for residents, tourists and businesses, and in rebuilding our reputation as a wonderful place to live, visit and work, it is very important to fund this department fully for their expanded services and coordinations. More arrests translate to more plea deals or trials and more focused activity for the District Attorney. Please reassure the public and meet what the city expects and deserves. Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter.

May 7, 2025 1:30PM

250131 [Hearing - District Attorney's Staffing Levels]

Sponsor: Dorsey

Hearing to assess staffing levels and needs within the District Attorney's Office, including an evaluation of the department's capacity to expand in coordination with other public safety agencies, the resources necessary for full implementation of Proposition 36 as well as any other resource gaps, challenges related to recruitment and retention, recommending any legislative or budgetary actions to support these efforts; and requesting the District Attorney's Office to report.

2/4/25; RECEIVED AND ASSIGNED to the Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee.

2/10/25; REFERRED TO DEPARTMENT.

4/21/25; TRANSFERRED to the Budget and Appropriations Committee.

Dona Crowder
dona@donacrowder.com

Wire Fraud is Real. Before wiring any money, call the intended recipient at a number you know is valid to confirm the instructions. Additionally, please note that the sender does not have authority to bind a party to a real estate contract via written or verbal communication.

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: 4 Letters From Julien DeFrance
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 11:43:57 AM
Attachments: [4 Letters From Julien DeFrance.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 4 letters from Julien DeFrance regarding various subjects.

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: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Muni Customer Service](#); [CON, Munifunding \(CON\)](#); [constituentrqst@sfmta.com](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Press Office, Mayor \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Re: Muni cops issue just 8 citations a day; many inspectors are on leave
Date: Thursday, May 1, 2025 6:31:24 PM

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,
Dear undemocratically-appointed SFMTA Board,

Enough with all the lies!

Barely 10% of MUNI riders pay their fare when boarding. Not the other way around.

Anyone telling you otherwise just LIES to you and deserves to be suspended.

<https://sfstandard.com/2025/04/30/san-francisco-muni-inspectors-issue-few-ticke/>

As for these so-called fare “officers” who seem to have a hard time finding more than 8 offenders to issues fines/citations to per day, how about offering them prescription glasses? LASIK maybe? Open your eyes, grow some balls, and do your job.

How about you take a ride and find out for yourself what’s really going on here?

Dozens of fare offenders board the bus at every single stop, hundreds of times every day.

Finally, if anyone is having some “climate anxiety” or any other kind of “anxiety” related to their job, needs to be “on leave”, and just can’t show up anymore, how about finding another line of work more suited to them?

If they can’t do their job, just fire them all, and hire someone who will.

<https://sfstandard.com/2025/04/30/san-francisco-muni-inspectors-issue-few-ticke/>

Please advise.

JD.

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Muni Customer Service](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [constituentrqst@sfmta.com](#); [CON_Munifunding \(CON\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Press Office, Mayor \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Re: Muni cops issue just 8 citations a day; many inspectors are on leave
Date: Friday, May 2, 2025 5:30:47 PM

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

Good afternoon,

Please check out the bus 49 (bus number 6624) that just passed city hall around 5:15 PM, heading do the mission.

For barely 1..2 people tapping their cards at every Van Ness Ave stop, easily 2 dozens fare evaders were rapidly crowding the bus every single time.

We all ended up packed line sardines. This shouldn't have been the case.

Operators shouldn't under any circumstances let anyone board for free. Offenders should be turned away. Plain and simple, common sense.

And where were those fare officers by the way?

Clearly they would have done a major hit tonight, 100s of citations in just a few minutes. Much better than their 8/day "performance" that made the headlines.

Please advise.

On May 1, 2025, at 18:31, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,
Dear undemocratically-appointed SFMTA Board,

Enough with all the lies!

Barely 10% of MUNI riders pay their fare when boarding. Not the other way around.

Anyone telling you otherwise just LIES to you and deserves to be suspended.

<https://sfstandard.com/2025/04/30/san-francisco-muni-inspectors-issue-few-tickets/>

As for these so-called fare “officers” who seem to have a hard time finding more than 8 offenders to issues fines/citations to per day, how about offering them prescription glasses? LASIK maybe? Open your eyes, grow some balls, and do your job.

How about you take a ride and find out for yourself what’s really going on here?

Dozens of fare offenders board the bus at every single stop, hundreds of times every day.

Finally, if anyone is having some “climate anxiety” or any other kind of “anxiety” related to their job, needs to be “on leave”, and just can’t show up anymore, how about finding another line of work more suited to them?

If they can’t do their job, just fire them all, and hire someone who will.

<https://sfstandard.com/2025/04/30/san-francisco-muni-inspectors-issue-few-tickets/>

Please advise.

JD.

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Press Office, Mayor \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Re: S.F. city departments overcharge each other millions as city faces down massive deficit
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 4:40:28 PM

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,

This type of BS must stop immediately, yet justifies the case for something like DOGE, here, locally, in San Francisco.

Our hard-earned taxpayer dollars are continuously wasted on random, stupid pet projects, so-called “non-profits”, and other useless/unnecessary expenses, instead of going towards the city’s infrastructure and the basic functions and responsibilities of government.

Time for efficiency. Time to be nimble. And most importantly, time to lower our taxes.

<https://missionlocal.org/2025/04/sf-overbudgeting-city-departments-budget-deficit/>

Please advise.

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Press Office, Mayor \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Re: After Demanding City Workers Return to Office Four Days Per Week, Mayor Lurie Grants Reprieve Until August
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 4:42:54 PM

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

Everybody, butts in seats, 5 days a week, please.
Effective immediately, not weeks and months away.

The taxpayers we are deserve it.

On Apr 24, 2025, at 18:50, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,

Please! Just screw those unions, and bring those people back to work immediately.

We taxpayers deserve results, and those people being at work full time, 5 days a week. Not 4.

Most importantly... Now. Not in 4 months.

We've already made enough concessions and given them enough time and notice.

Make it happen. Thank you.

<https://sfist.com/2025/04/22/after-demanding-city-workers-return-to-office-four-days-per-week-mayor-lurie-grants-reprieve-until-august/>

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: JFK
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 11:40:54 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding John F. Kennedy Drive.

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: Katherine Alba <Katherine.Alba.493114477@grassrootsmessages.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 4, 2025 10:23 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: JFK

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

A compromise for John F. Kennedy Drive was reached in 2007 that allowed all users of Golden

Gate Park to share the roads. It is time to reopen JFK Drive back to the way it was before COVID. The select few that are the most vocal are doing us all a disservice that want a reasonable compromise.

Please reopen JFK Drive like it was before COVID!

Regards,
Katherine Alba
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Please approve Item #26, affirming CEQA statutory exemption determination for the Mid-Valencia Curbside Protected Bikeway Project
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 8:42:53 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding **File No. 241193:**

Motion affirming the determination by the Planning Department that the proposed Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) Mid-Valencia Curbside Protected Bikeway project is statutorily exempt from environmental review.

Regards,

John Bullock

Office of the Clerk of the Board

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-5184

BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Christopher Kucera <christopherkucera@icloud.com>

Sent: Monday, January 27, 2025 11:58 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; MTABoard@sfmta.com; Wise, Viktoriya (MTA) <Viktoriya.A.Wise@sfmta.com>; Leung, Kimberly (MTA) <Kimberly.Leung@sfmta.com>; Valencia@sfmta.com; BikeRoll@sfmta.com; CAC@sfmta.com; Luke@streetsforward.org
Subject: Please approve Item #26, affirming CEQA statutory exemption determination for the Mid-Valencia Curbside Protected Bikeway Project

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Alongside Streets Forward, I urge you to approve Item #26—affirming the CEQA statutory exemption determination for the SFMTA Mid-Valencia Curbside Protected Bikeway Project—and reject the baseless CEQA appeal of this improvement that will make Valencia Street safer for all people, better for business, and help more people shift trips from cars to bikes, scooters, and other modes of sustainable transportation. SFMTA and the City have been working on an effective bike lane design for Valencia Street between 15th and 23rd Streets for over six years, this curbside bike lane design has overwhelming support from residents, advocates, and merchants, and unanimous approval by the SFMTA Board of Directors. Additionally, this improvement is categorically exempt from CEQA as a bike and pedestrian safety project per SB 922. It's time for the City to move forward with replacing the center bikeway with curbside bike lanes on this eight-block stretch of Valencia. Please affirm the statutory exemption determination, reject the appeal, and allow SFMTA to begin installation of the curbside bike lanes that have been designed and are overwhelmingly supported.

While the statutory exemption determination should be affirmed—and the appeal rejected—the curbside bike lane design can be approved, notably by widening the bike lanes and increasing on-street bike/scooter parking, and the curbside bike lanes should be extended south on Valencia to Cesar Chavez Street, closing the critical gap of Valencia between 23rd and Cesar Chavez Streets. Please urge SFMTA to update its design from 2020 for curbside bike lanes between 23rd and Cesar Chavez and approve funding in your role as the SFCTA Board. This 3.5-block stretch of Valencia has more than enough roadway width to accommodate curbside bike lanes, only two parklets—both of which existed, and were designed for, in 2020. It also connects people on bikes and scooters to the paint-only, unprotected bike lanes on Cesar Chavez and the modal filter at Duncan Street / Tiffany Avenue that helps people get to the paint-only, unprotected bike lanes on San Jose Avenue. Please also urge SFMTA to

upgrade the paint-only, unprotected bike lanes on Cesar Chavez Street and San Jose Avenue to curbside protected bike lanes.

I urge you to approve Item #26, affirming the CEQA statutory exemption determination for the SFMTA Mid-Valencia Curbside Protected Bikeway Project and rejecting the baseless CEQA appeal against it.

Thank you,

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: Prioritize MUNI Reform Before Considering New Taxes
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 8:51:58 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding California State Senate Bill No. 63, introduced by Senators Scott Wiener and Jesse Arreguin, to enact legislation authorizing a revenue measure to invest in transportation in the San Francisco Bay Area.

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: Doug McKirahan <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 7:37 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <MelgarStaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <ChanStaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Prioritize MUNI Reform Before Considering New Taxes

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors,
 Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent

Doug McKirahan

Email

ratt57@pacbell.net

Subject

Prioritize MUNI Reform Before Considering New Taxes

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Senator Wiener, and Assembly Member Stefani:

As a resident of your district, I urge you to champion what San Franciscans are truly ready to support: a functional, reliable, and efficient MUNI system that puts riders first.

We all want great public transit. But that means making accountability and operational reform a top priority—before asking voters to consider new, permanent funding sources like the regional sales tax increase proposed under SB 63.

Without a clear plan to restore public trust and improve basic service, this measure will fall into the same category as others that have failed at the ballot box. Voters want to say yes to transit—but only when they see results.

Please lead the way by ensuring any new funding is tied to measurable service improvements, fiscal responsibility, transparency and that the funds are reserved ONLY for MUNI transit services and nothing else. Let's fix what's broken before adding more to the bill.

Thank you for your service and for standing with San Franciscans who rely on this system every day.

Thank you,

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: 4 Letters Regarding File No. 240967
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 12:11:30 PM
Attachments: [4 Letters Regarding File No. 240967.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 4 letters regarding **File No. 240967**:

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the E-Bike Incentive Fund to support implementation of an electric bicycle (or “e-bike”) incentive program administered by the Department of the Environment.

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: [Audra Sparks](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please fund the e-bike incentive program to help families, working people, and all San Franciscans shift trips to bikes, reduce car traffic, demand for parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and fatalities/injuries, while increasing public s...
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2008 4:22:07 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the E-Bike Incentive Program, which will help more families, workers, and other people shift trips from cars to bikes, increasing safety, affordability, and equity, while reducing car traffic, demand for car parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, roadway construction and maintenance costs, and roadway crashes, fatalities, and injuries. Please work with the advocates behind the original program proposal to secure funding for the program from City, SFCTA, MTC, state, federal, and other funding sources (e.g. philanthropic foundations, wealthy individuals).

The e-bike incentive program — inspired by, and modeled off, effective programs in Denver, Colorado, Austin, Texas, and Atlanta, Georgia — will reduce the financial burden for families, workers, and other people who want to use bikes for transportation, with a larger incentive for low-income individuals and families who qualify. By helping more people purchase or lease e-bikes, you will decrease car traffic, demand for parking, costs related to roadway construction/maintenance, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and road fatalities/injuries while increasing economic activity, revenue for local businesses, community connectedness, public health, and public land available for trees, seating, parks, playgrounds, housing, and other more effective land uses. Due to the cost-saving effect of increased bike ridership and bike infrastructure, the e-bike incentive program may well net cost savings for the City, County, and state, something that is especially needed and beneficial given the budget deficit and crisis.

You can find more information about the original program proposal and related grassroots campaign at <https://urlavanan.click/v2/011...https://ebikeSF.org...YXAzO...>

In order for this program to be created and have its full potential impact, we need you to secure funding for the program. Will you commit to doing everything in your power to secure as much funding as possible as soon as possible?

Thank you.

Audra Sparks
1982 sparks@gmail.com
888 ofarrell street, apt. W1008
San Francisco, California 94109

From: marshallkathy2@icloud.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please fund the E-Bike Incentive program to help families, working people, and all San Franciscans shift trips to bikes, reduce car traffic, demand for parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and fatalities/injuries, while increasing public s...
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2014 6:55:04 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the E-Bike Incentive Program, which will help more families, workers, and other people shift trips from cars to bikes, increasing safety, affordability, and equity, while reducing car traffic, demand for car parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, roadway construction and maintenance costs, and roadway crashes, fatalities, and injuries. Please work with the advocates behind the original program proposal to secure funding for the program from City, SFCTA, MTC, state, federal, and other funding sources (e.g. philanthropic foundations, wealthy individuals).

The e-bike incentive program — inspired by, and modeled off, effective programs in Denver, Colorado, Austin, Texas, and Atlanta, Georgia — will reduce the financial burden for families, workers, and other people who want to use bikes for transportation, with a larger incentive for low-income individuals and families who qualify. By helping more people purchase or lease e-bikes, you will decrease car traffic, demand for parking, costs related to roadway construction/maintenance, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and road fatalities/injuries while increasing economic activity, revenue for local businesses, community connectedness, public health, and public land available for trees, seating, parks, playgrounds, housing, and other more effective land uses. Due to the cost-saving effect of increased bike ridership and bike infrastructure, the e-bike incentive program may well net cost savings for the City, County, and state, something that is especially needed and beneficial given the budget deficit and crisis.

You can find more information about the original program proposal and related grassroots campaign at https://urlavanan.click/v2/01/_https://eBikeSF.org__

In order for this program to be created and have its full potential impact, we need you to secure funding for the program. Will you commit to doing everything in your power to secure as much funding as possible as soon as possible?

Thank you.

marshallkathy2@icloud.com
333 12th st apt 818 San Francisco, Ca 94103
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Charles Levine
To: Board of Supervisors, SFCA
Subject: Please fund the e-bike incentive program to help families, working people, and all San Franciscans shift trips to bikes, reduce car traffic, demand for parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and fatalities/injuries, while increasing public s...
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 6:57:18 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the E-Bike Incentive Program, which will help more families, workers, and other people shift trips from cars to bikes, increasing safety, affordability, and equity, while reducing car traffic, demand for car parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, roadway construction and maintenance costs, and roadway crashes, fatalities, and injuries. Please work with the advocates behind the original program proposal to secure funding for the program from City, SFCTA, MTC, state, federal, and other funding sources (e.g. philanthropic foundations, wealthy individuals).

The e-bike incentive program — inspired by, and modeled off, effective programs in Denver, Colorado, Austin, Texas, and Atlanta, Georgia — will reduce the financial burden for families, workers, and other people who want to use bikes for transportation, with a larger incentive for low-income individuals and families who qualify. By helping more people purchase or lease e-bikes, you will decrease car traffic, demand for parking, costs related to roadway construction/maintenance, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and road fatalities/injuries while increasing economic activity, revenue for local businesses, community connectedness, public health, and public land available for trees, seating, parks, playgrounds, housing, and other more effective land uses. Due to the cost-saving effect of increased bike ridership and bike infrastructure, the e-bike incentive program may well net cost savings for the City, County, and state, something that is especially needed and beneficial given the budget deficit and crisis.

You can find more information about the original program proposal and related grassroots campaign at https://url.avanav.click/v2/01v/_...https://ebikeSF.org/_...YXAzOnNmZHQyOmEBbcoyMWISyQyNWEzMjg1M2FnNTVhYzhNmM4ZWRiZGQxNzo3OmNhZWI6Y2Q4NzAxM2M0ZmM3YmMxODk2Zjg0MGNhOTQzMT2hOWFiyzlwZGFkNjhZTk2ZDYwMmFkYTYxN2vKNTizZGNkMzp0OIQ6Tg.

In order for this program to be created and have its full potential impact, we need you to secure funding for the program. Will you commit to doing everything in your power to secure as much funding as possible as soon as possible?

Thank you.
Charles Levine

Charles Levine
charleslevine@att.net
1786 Filbert.
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Gabriel Arias
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please fund the e-bike incentive program to help families, working people, and all San Franciscans shift trips to bikes, reduce car traffic, demand for parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and fatalities/injuries, while increasing public s...
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2015 5:16:24 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors.

I am writing to urge you to fund the E-Bike Incentive Program, which will help more families, workers, and other people shift trips from cars to bikes, increasing safety, affordability, and equity, while reducing car traffic, demand for car parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, roadway construction and maintenance costs, and roadway crashes, fatalities, and injuries. Please work with the advocates behind the original program proposal to secure funding for the program from City, SFCTA, MTC, state, federal, and other funding sources (e.g. philanthropic foundations, wealthy individuals).

The e-bike incentive program — inspired by, and modeled off, effective programs in Denver, Colorado, Austin, Texas, and Atlanta, Georgia — will reduce the financial burden for families, workers, and other people who want to use bikes for transportation, with a larger incentive for low-income individuals and families who qualify. By helping more people purchase or lease e-bikes, you will decrease car traffic, demand for parking, costs related to roadway construction/maintenance, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and road fatalities/injuries while increasing economic activity, revenue for local businesses, community connectedness, public health, and public land available for trees, seating, parks, playgrounds, housing, and other more effective land uses. Due to the cost-saving effect of increased bike ridership and bike infrastructure, the e-bike incentive program may well net cost savings for the City, County, and state, something that is especially needed and beneficial given the budget deficit and crisis.

You can find more information about the original program proposal and related grassroots campaign at <https://ut.avanan.click/v2/01f...https://eBikeSF.org> _____YXAzOnNmZHDyOmEbzpIMTZhZDVkNTc2MzAxYTc1NzI3Y2NmNDc2MGZjYmFmYj03QjZkNWm6NDIYWMYOGQzMmE2NmMxYWFjZDNhODVkmjYzMDQzNmjOWU5OWU1NDM1MD2mNDRkNTU1MmJ3NmQ0Mz15NDBiZDp0OIQ6Tg.

In order for this program to be created and have its full potential impact, we need you to secure funding for the program. Will you commit to doing everything in your power to secure as much funding as possible as soon as possible?

Thank you.

Gabriel Arias
gabe5565@yahoo.com
673 grand ave south San Francisco
South San Francisco, California 94080

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation](#); [Simon, Nahel \(DPW\)](#); [Whitt, Alisha \(DPW\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 4 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250310 & 250311
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 12:16:27 PM
Attachments: [4 Letters Regarding File Nos. 250310 & 250311.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 4 letters regarding **File Nos. 250310 & 250311**.

File No. 250310: Hearing to consider objections to a report of assessment costs submitted by the Director of Public Works for inspection and/or abatement of blighted conditions ordered to be performed by said Director pursuant to Chapter 80 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, the costs thereof having been paid for out of a blight abatement fund; scheduled pursuant to Motion No. M25-042 (File No. 250309), approved on April 15, 2025.

File No. 250311: Resolution approving report of assessment costs submitted by the Director of Public Works for inspection and/or repair of blighted properties ordered to be performed by said Director pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 80, the costs thereof having been paid for out of a blight abatement fund.

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: [Natalie Drees](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Written Comments Regarding : Citation: 2854425; 3232 Mission Street
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 3:09:57 PM
Attachments: [02_12_2024 Receipt for Graffiti Abatement.pdf](#)

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

To the Honorable Members of the Board:

I respectfully request that you waive this fee and penalty.

I enrolled in the City's graffiti abatement pilot program in December 2023, with the understanding that the City would handle graffiti removal. When I received a second notice, I personally hired someone to abate the graffiti (receipt attached) and notified DPW with photos on February 14, 2024 via the email below. I received no response and assumed the matter was resolved—until I was notified of a public hearing.

It is unfair to penalize property owners for the City's lack of follow-up, especially when the program's terms did not indicate the property owner would be responsible for abatement if the City did not act promptly.

Sincerely,
Natalie Drees

VOTED

- *SFAA Property Management Company of the Year 2022*
- *SFAA Customer Service of the Year 2021*
- *SFAA Management Company of the Year 2014*
- *SFAA Property Manager of the Year 2012*

Natalie M. Drees
President
DRE #01363493
Lingsch Realty
DRE #02104503
3234 Mission Street, Suite 1
San Francisco, CA 94110
Direct: (415) 648-1517
www.lingschrealty.com

From: Natalie Drees

Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 10:49 AM
To: hardshiphearings@sfdpw.org
Subject: Citation: 2854425

Hi,

I recently received a blight inspection fee notice.

I was unaware I needed to resolve this blight as I sent in the forms to opt into the new Graffiti abatement program back in December. It was my belief that by sending it in, the city was going to take care of it. The graffiti has since been removed. Photos attached.

I ask that you please excuse this citation for the misunderstanding and prompt removal once receiving the blight inspection fee.

Thanks,
Natalie Drees

VOTED

- *SFAA Property Management Company of the Year 2022*
- *SFAA Customer Service of the Year 2021*
- *SFAA Management Company of the Year 2014*
- *SFAA Property Manager of the Year 2012*

Natalie M. Drees
President
DRE #01363493
Lingsch Realty
DRE #02104503
3234 Mission Street, Suite 1
San Francisco, CA 94110
Direct: (415) 648-1517
www.lingschrealty.com

Natalie Drees

From: fidel araujo <fidelaraujo1970@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 12, 2024 1:51 PM
To: Natalie Drees

3234 mission st .

- Paint the graffiti of the front building.

Labor:::\$60.00

Thanks Natalie

W DELL \$38
210

Jimmy's
- Est. 2001 -
SPAGHETTI
SHACK

CELEBRATING
150 YEARS OF
RESILIENCE.

EAT

20
Panchos
2 MILES
415-282-9088

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

</



FOLK

MOVE · BREATHE · RESTORE · BELONG

Emmy's
- Est. 2001 -
SPAGHETTI
SHACK



Las Panchas

2 MILES

441-8900

415-783-9888

24 HRS

24 HRS

From: [Natasha Roccaforte](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Citation 2935638 / File No. 250309
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 2:03:47 PM
Attachments: [695 Bryant Graffiti.png](#)

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

Hello,

I would like to provide written comments and pictures for the hearing scheduled on May 13, 2025 pursuant to Motion No. M25-042 (File No. 250309) to the Board of Supervisors. My written comments are below:

I am the property owner of 150 Toland Street in San Franciso. A notice was recently posted on my property regarding an unpaid blight citation (2935638) in the amount of \$362.

This property is free of graffiti and free of a mural at this time. We pride ourselves on maintaining our properties in great condition and keeping our commercial tenants happy.

I strongly feel that I do not owe the alleged \$362 fine for the following reasons:

The City of San Francisco is a big part of the graffiti problem- in many cases the City chooses NOT abate graffiti on their City owned property. We have filed numerous complaints on City owned property regarding graffiti issues and these complaints fall on deaf ears and the graffiti goes unabated for long periods of time. For example, the San Francisco skate parks which should be a clean and safe environment for all ages, are littered with graffiti. The SF youth who frequent these parks now feel its acceptable and then choose to grab spray paint cans and tag neighboring buildings such as ours. This is wrong.

If you care to look, we refiled complaints on the following city owned properties:

- 209 Pennsylvania (Case 101001878445). This site is jointly owed with a Non-Profit housing development company. The prior complaints have been closed, for the City claims that this mess is a “Mural” and not graffiti. You be the judge.
- 695 Bryant Street (Case 101001872150). This is a city owned Homeless Shelter. The East wall above the neighbors building is a monster sized graffiti tag which is unsightly to all the Bay Bridge traffic coming into SF. We have filed numerous complaints which get cleared without the graffiti being abated.

1465 Potrero Ave. Potrero Del Sol City Park. This park includes a skate park within it. The graffiti here is completely unacceptable. If the City of SF would like to see a well-maintained skate park, I would suggest they have a look at Heather Farms Park in Walnut Creek.

Given the City doesn't abate their problems and plays the "it's a mural" card, why wouldn't all property owners do the same?? It is not graffiti, it is a mural, and I permitted the tagging! I just spoke to the 311 complaint system and tried to get them to print out the Closed complaints on 209 Pennsylvania Ave for this is a site where the city has been playing the "Mural" card. Unfortunately, the 311 operator was unable to provide me with the closed complaint history. I encourage our supervisors to visit this site and dig into the "mural" history here.


Chris Harney
HC&M Commercial Properties, Inc.
1234 Mariposa Street
San Francisco, CA 94107
415-865-6101 Office
415-999-6007 Mobile
DRE# 01108232





BSPC 316





695 Bryant Street



From: [Millie Yang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Hearing Notice-Report of Assessment Costs-Blighted Properties Program
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 5:39:42 PM
Attachments: [Angela Calvillo.doc](#)

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

Please see attached response. Thank you.

Millie

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

Subject: Hearing Notice-Report of Assessment Costs-Blighted Properties Program

Hearing Date: May 13, 2025

Dear Ms. Angela Calvillo,

In response to your Notice of Board of Supervisors Public Hearing dated April 29, 2025, I wish to inform you that I am unable to attend the hearing on this matter. I am 76 years old and am suffering from sciatic nerve damage. I am unable to stand still for more than 5 minutes and am not able to walk for more than 5 minutes. I wish to submit the following comments regarding the graffiti on the side wall of my property.

This has been an ongoing problem in the neighborhood. I have just painted the exteriors of the property in May of 2024, and after two weeks, the graffiti was on the wall. My tenant informed me that they did see two people spraying on the wall, but the tenants were reluctant to stop the action. They were concern about their safety. But nevertheless, they did call the SF police department regarding the situation, but no actions were taken by the SF policy department.

I want to keep my property clean and tidy. No one wants to see graffiti on the wall. I just don't know what can I do to stop the people from spraying on my wall. I tried to contact the Walgreen's manager, since the sprayers gain their access from Walgreen's parking lot to spray on my property wall. But Walgreen took no action to secure their parking lot.

I cannot afford to keep on paining the wall every week. We thought of putting chicken wires by the wall, but that will prevent us from painting the wall again when needed.

I am writing to request the Superiores for a recommendation to keep the wall clean. I cannot afford to paint the wall every week and it is not a feasible solution either. After all, I pay my property tax, keep myself in compliance with all the City codes and regulations. I think The City has the responsibility to protect my property from Graffiti, not just sending me a bill which does not solve the problem.

Millie Yang,
2312 32nd Ave.
San Francisco, Ca 94116
415-564-4399
5/5/2025

MILLIE YANG TRUST 2003
2312 32ND AVE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94116

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 MAY 08 AM09:38

q3

Hearing Notice - Report of Assessment Costs - Blighted Properties Program
Hearing Date: May 13, 2025
Page 2

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (bos@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (<https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc>). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, May 9, 2025.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact our office at bos.legislation@sfgov.org or call (415) 554-5184 if you have any questions.

Angela Calvillo
Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco

jw:ak:ll:ams

DATED ~ MAILED ~ EMAILED ~ POSTED: May 2, 2025



Inspection and Code Enforcement

DPW-BoardofSupervisors@sfcdpw.org | 415-554-2660 | 49 South Van Ness Ave, 3rd Flr, San Francisco, CA 94103

NOTICE OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PUBLIC HEARING

April 29, 2025

MILLIE YANG TRUST 2003
2312 32ND AVE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94116

Violation Location: 1278 22ND
AVE
Citation #: 2843775

Under the provisions of the San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 80, it is the responsibility of property owners to maintain their property free of public nuisances, and in a safe condition free of blight and graffiti.

According to our records your Blight (graffiti) citation and/or abatement invoice has not been paid. We recently sent an overdue notice reminding you of the overdue fee. To date we still have not received payment. You are hereby notified of a hearing before the Board of Supervisors to place these costs as an assessment on your property tax along with a 12% Administrative fee.

Hearing Date: **Tuesday, May 13, 2025**
Time: **3:00 PM**
Location: **Board of Supervisors' Legislative Chamber**
City Hall, Room 250
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Board's Website: <http://www.sfcos.org/index.aspx?page=2314>

To pay the amount, please remit payment along with the below stub to the address below.

Note: We accept Cashier's Checks only. No personal checks.

Payment by Check	Pay Online
Department of Public Works Operations, Code Enforcement Division 49 South Van Ness Ave., Suite 300 San Francisco, CA 94103 Attn: Blight-Graffiti BOS 2025 Phone: 415-641-2341	http://bsm.sfdpw.org click on "Pay/Manage Invoices" click on "Admin Citation/Blight #" enter the "Citation #" in Search Box

Detach and return this portion with your payment

Citation #	Block/Lot	Violation Location
2843775	1729/023B	1278 22ND AVE
Responsible Person	Invoice Number	Total Balance Due
MILLIE YANG TRUST 2003	399863	\$362.00
Mailing Address	Amount Paid	
1729, 2312 32ND AVE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94116		

Inspection Balance: \$362.00
Inspection Invoice # 399863
Abatement Balance: \$
Abatement Invoice #

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

Subject: Hearing Notice-Report of Assessment Costs-Blighted Properties Program

Hearing Date: May 13, 2025

Dear Ms. Angela Calvillo,


In response to your Notice of Board of Supervisors Public Hearing dated April 29, 2025, I wish to inform you that I am unable to attend the hearing on this matter. I am 76 years old and am suffering from sciatic nerve damage. I am unable to stand still for more than 5 minutes and am not able to walk for more than 5 minutes. I wish to submit the following comments regarding the graffiti on the side wall of my property.

This has been an ongoing problem in the neighborhood. I have just painted the exteriors of the property in May of 2024, and after two weeks, the graffiti was on the wall. My tenant informed me that they did see two people spraying on the wall, but the tenants were reluctant to stop the action. They were concerned about their safety. But nevertheless, they did call the SF police department regarding the situation, but no actions were taken by the SF police department.

I want to keep my property clean and tidy. No one wants to see graffiti on the wall. I just don't know what can I do to stop the people from spraying on my wall. I tried to contact the Walgreen's manager, since the sprayers gain their access from Walgreen's parking lot to spray on my property wall. But Walgreen took no action to secure their parking lot.

I cannot afford to keep on painting the wall every week. We thought of putting chicken wires by the wall, but that will prevent us from painting the wall again when needed.

I am writing to request the Superiores for a recommendation to keep the wall clean. I cannot afford to paint the wall every week and it is not a feasible solution either. After all, I pay my property tax, keep myself in compliance with all the City codes and regulations. I think The City has the responsibility to protect my property from Graffiti, not just sending me a bill which does not solve the problem.



Millie Yang,
2312 32nd Ave.
San Francisco, Ca 94116
415-564-4399
5/5/2025

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)
Subject: 6 Letters regarding Zoning
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 12:20:42 PM
Attachments: [6 Letters Regarding Zoning.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached for 6 letters regarding zoning.

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: kevzhang78@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Kevin Zhang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Sunday, May 4, 2025 9:50:35 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hey there! I'm writing in support of upzoning in San Francisco. I personally think that too many people are motivated by personal gain and interest to see the bigger picture - that a growing city with a growing population (and a growing housing supply) are critical to keeping San Francisco abundant and a great place to live.

I hope the upzoning reforms on Mayor Lurie's agenda go through and help us achieve this monumental goal of breaking free of the stagnation of our city and get us back on track in the right direction. Thanks for reading this!

Sincerely,
Kevin Zhang
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: marvin424@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Noreen Movitz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 4:49:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my deep concern about Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan. This proposal, which would increase "zoning capacity" to an unprecedented 800,000 housing units, goes far beyond what San Francisco actually needs—and puts our neighborhoods, tenants, and small businesses at risk. This plan is excessive, unnecessary and counterproductive.

San Francisco already has over 72,000 approved but unbuilt units and 40,000 vacant homes. These figures point to a housing system that needs better management, not more speculation. This plan removes long-standing neighborhood protections and allows dense, oversized buildings—even on residential streets and corner lots up to 65 feet high—with no guarantees of affordability.

What's being proposed is permanent, while the housing targets behind it are speculative. There's no clear infrastructure plan, no updated environmental review, and no commitment to protect the identity or stability of our communities.

I urge you to push back on the state's unrealistic demands and instead pursue a balanced, community-led strategy that prioritizes affordability, accountability, and livability.

Thank you for your service and attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,
Noreen Movitz
San Francisco, CA 94111

From: paulamccabe64@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Paula Mc Cabe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 5:10:34 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my deep concern about Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan. This proposal, which would increase "zoning capacity" to an unprecedented 800,000 housing units, goes far beyond what San Francisco actually needs—and puts our neighborhoods, tenants, and small businesses at risk. This plan is excessive, unnecessary and counterproductive.

San Francisco already has over 72,000 approved but unbuilt units and 40,000 vacant homes. These figures point to a housing system that needs better management, not more speculation. This plan removes long-standing neighborhood protections and allows dense, oversized buildings—even on residential streets and corner lots up to 65 feet high—with no guarantees of affordability.

What's being proposed is permanent, while the housing targets behind it are speculative. There's no clear infrastructure plan, no updated environmental review, and no commitment to protect the identity or stability of our communities.

I urge you to push back on the state's unrealistic demands and instead pursue a balanced, community-led strategy that prioritizes affordability, accountability, and livability.

Thank you for your service and attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,
Paula Mc Cabe
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: dzevin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Daniel Zevin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 7:27:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my deep concern about Mayor Luri's upzoning plan, which seems to be completely ignorant when it comes to climate change. What will we all experience if we keep doing business as usual, i.e., build, build, build? The urban heat island (UHI) index of a city estimates how much hotter it is due to the characteristics of its built environment. As of 2024, San Francisco scored the second highest average UHI index per capita in the U.S. (9.1°F), with only New York City, at 9.7°F, ranking higher (<https://urlavaman.click/v2/601/> www.climatecentral.org/climate-matters/urban-heat-islands-2024). More significantly, San Francisco's UHI index was only 8.8°F in 2023, which means it's already rising fast enough as things stand now. In the face of this inconvenient truth, this upzoning plan is simply out of touch with reality.

Yes, affordable housing is an issue in San Francisco, and I support SMART affordable housing initiatives that are exclusively for low and middle income San Franciscans, especially for those that actually work here too. But your current "anything goes" developer giveaway is just another nail in the coffin for our health and well-being. Climate change notwithstanding, constant, ever-present bright lights and concrete also contribute to lowered human lifespans as well as biodiversity loss (darkskymass.org/resources/the-city-dark/). San Francisco, so long an oasis from these trends when compared to "Disneyland-esque" Tokyo and Manhattan, is now almost their equal. How far are you willing to go in this direction?

When just about every house touches every other house in this City, and any available spare room is usually rented, I think you could argue San Franciscans have done their part and deserve what little remaining free, clean air and nature we can hold on to. I therefore urge you to rethink your future vision for this beloved City. Above all, we cannot just put our heads in the sand and hope unchecked/unregulated development will solve everything without equally damaging consequences down the line.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Daniel Zevin
91427

From: lpanta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Laura Pantaleo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 10:58:02 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live in the neighborhood (Telegraph Hill) and swim in the bay weekly. This will harm the area near aquatic park and many residence and visitors enjoy and depend on this area. This added pollution from construction and future density would be harmful to human health, wildlife and the bay climate. I'm writing to express my deep concern about Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan. This proposal, which would increase "zoning capacity" to an unprecedented 800,000 housing units, goes far beyond what San Francisco actually needs—and puts our neighborhoods, tenants, and small businesses at risk. This plan is excessive, unnecessary and counterproductive. This seems like a hazard to both tenants, in terms of earth quake safety and a threat to the surrounding environment and wildlife.

San Francisco already has over 72,000 approved but unbuilt units and 40,000 vacant homes. These figures point to a housing system that needs better management, not more speculation. This plan removes long-standing neighborhood protections and allows dense, oversized buildings—even on residential streets and corner lots up to 65 feet high—with no guarantees of affordability. I am not opposed to affordable housing but it needs to be done responsibly.

What's being proposed is permanent, while the housing targets behind it are speculative. There's no clear infrastructure plan, no updated environmental review, and no commitment to protect the identity or stability of our communities.

I urge you to push back on the state's unrealistic demands and instead pursue a balanced, community-led strategy that prioritizes affordability, accountability, and livability.

Thank you for your service and attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,
Laura Pantaleo
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: strobelroger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Roger Strobel](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 3:42:44 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my deep concern about Mayor Lurie's upzoning plan. This proposal, which would increase "zoning capacity" to an unprecedented 800,000 housing units, goes far beyond what San Francisco actually needs—and puts our neighborhoods, tenants, and small businesses at risk. This plan is excessive, unnecessary and counterproductive.

San Francisco already has over 72,000 approved but unbuilt units and 40,000 vacant homes. These figures point to a housing system that needs better management, not more speculation. This plan removes long-standing neighborhood protections and allows dense, oversized buildings—even on residential streets and corner lots up to 65 feet high—with no guarantees of affordability.

What's being proposed is permanent, while the housing targets behind it are speculative. There's no clear infrastructure plan, no updated environmental review, and no commitment to protect the identity or stability of our communities.

I urge you to push back on the state's unrealistic demands and instead pursue a balanced, community-led strategy that prioritizes affordability, accountability, and livability.

Thank you for your service and attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,
Roger Strobel
San Francisco, CA 94133

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](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 32 Letters regarding the Upcoming City Budget
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 12:22:54 PM
Attachments: [32 Letters Regarding the Upcoming City Budget.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached for 32 additional letters regarding the upcoming City budget.

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: [John Goldberg](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:44:41 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent John Goldberg

Email JRG2025@gmail.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be **FULLY** funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [Hatun Noguera](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:44:45 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 and Mayor

From your constituent [Hatun Noguera](#)

Email noguera@changes.world

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [John Robert Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:45:30 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **John Robert Smith**

Email timepuzzle@earthlink.net

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [David Mace](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:47:46 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 **David Mace**

Email **dmace7@gmail.com**

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [Tom Flint](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:54:39 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Tom Flint**

Email thomasflint1@yahoo.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: Cornell Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:09:35 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 and Mayor

From your constituent Cornell Lee

Email corny1215@gmail.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [Martha Ehmann Conte](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:15:30 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Martha Ehmann Conte**

Email **martha@ehmannconte.com**

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [Brian Key](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Brian Key**

Email **Brian@BrianKey.com**

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: richard brandi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:30:45 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 and Mayor

From your constituent richard brandi
Email rbrandi@earthlink.net

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,
I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [Usha and John Burns](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:39:42 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Usha and John Burns**

Email **Johnmburns48@yahoo.com**

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: Paul McLain-Lugowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:41:32 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 and Mayor

From your constituent Paul McLain-Lugowski

Email gunner93720@hotmail.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: Iris Bucchioni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:41:39 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 and Mayor

From your constituent Iris Bucchioni

Email irismvbucchioni@yahoo.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [Holly Peterson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:56:40 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Holly Peterson**
Email holly.peterson@me.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,
I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: jason jungreis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 10:17:35 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 and Mayor

From your constituent jason jungreis
Email jasonjungreis@gmail.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [Esfir Shrabyer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 10:19:43 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 **Esfir Shrabyer**
Email to_fira@yahoo.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,
I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,
Esfir Shrabyer

From: [Neville Morcom](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 10:25:26 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Neville Morcom**

Email **nmorcom@comcast.net**

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [Pat Stanton](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 11:06:40 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Pat Stanton**

Email pstanton1224@gmail.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [Ronald Mungai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 11:34:30 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent [Ronald Mungai](#)

Email limo4usf@gmail.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [Gretchen Koch](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 11:43:35 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Gretchen Koch**

Email **gretchenee@gmail.com**

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,
Gretchen Koch

From: Shirley Fogarino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 1:54:36 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Shirley Fogarino

Email scoopfoggy@prodigy.net

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: Brian Kendall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 1:59:26 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 Brian Kendall
Email brikendall@aol.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,
I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be **FULLY** funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [Daphne Blumenthal](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 3:48:39 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 [Daphne Blumenthal](#)

Email daphne@tierrait.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [Jasmine Madatian](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 7:40:36 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Jasmine Madatian**

Email madatian.j@gmail.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report). Especially the SF Bicycle Coalition. They are ruining the city.

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: Griffin Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 9:41:26 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 and Mayor

From your constituent Griffin Lee

Email griffin.gregory.lee@gmail.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Jennifer Raub
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 12:35:12 PM

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 Jennifer Raub
Email jenneraub@hotmail.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,
I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery. We also need to keep MUNI running as much as humanly possible so we can get to/from work and appointments. While scrutiny over the entire SFMTA budget is critical, we do need to ensure we keep

transit running.

Sincerely,
Jennifer

From: Barklee Sanders
To: Barklee Sanders (DCDP); Chayfetz (DCDP); Mayor's Office (DCDP); Waller, Shanna (DCDP); [Barklee Sanders](#) (DCDP); [Chayfetz](#) (DCDP); [Mayor's Office](#) (DCDP); [Waller, Shanna](#) (DCDP)
Subject: I Support Mayor Luria's Budget Goals! It is time to right-size SF's Budget
Date: Tuesday, May 4, 2021 12:46:47 PM

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 Barklee Sanders

Email barkleesanders@gmail.com

I Support Mayor Luria's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Luria, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Luria for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Treasure Island In SF has faced 500+ power outages in 25+ years, an outage every 2-3 weeks is unacceptable! We demand an emergency declaration NOW, a detailed grid upgrade report & cost analysis to ensure reliability
https://url.avanan.click/v2/01/_https://www.treasureislandspoweroutages.com/_YXA2OnNmZHOyOmE6bzwNjEzZDnZDc2zTYSNjpc0TA3ODkyZDY5ZDA2NzE4MT03OjZmOGY8M2lyNDdYmM3ZlYWM3ZTg2YWJzN2Q4YWNzY4NvWeNTRjZWY5MzhjODI4Zj5UNTE2ZGQzNt0M2lYWQ2Yzp0OjQ6Tg

Sincerely,

From: [Andrea Galvin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 1:38:35 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Andrea Galvin**

Email **andreacgalvin@gmail.com**

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [Elizabeth Clark](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 7:39:37 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Elizabeth Clark**

Email swimeclark@gmail.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: Judi Hurabiell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 8:32:40 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Judi Hurabiell
Email jmhurabiell1@gail.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,
I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [Carla Schlemminger](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 7:33:27 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Carla Schlemminger**

Email carlas@yahoo.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: [David Crane](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 10:20:30 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent David Crane
Email davidgcrane@gmail.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,
I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be **FULLY** funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

From: Brad McMillan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 10:41:25 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 Brad McMillan

Email mcmillan@viselect.com

I Support Mayor Lurie's Budget Goals. It is time to right-size SF's Budget!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors and Controller,

I fully support right-sizing the San Francisco budget!

Thank you Mayor Lurie for understanding that we need structural budget reform right now.

It is clear to residents that:

Deep cuts are needed, especially in the departments that have grown over \$100M since 2012. We would support a \$2B reduction in the SF budget.

All fraud should be rooted out.

There should be no funding going to non-existent or wasteful non-profits. (See 2023 Grand Jury Report).

There should be no city funding of any organizations or non-profits that lobby SF on behalf of special interests. Anything going to organizations that lobby SF officials should be terminated immediately.

Finally, our public safety systems, SFPD, SFFD, DA, Sheriff, etc should be FULLY funded - these are foundational for San Francisco's recovery.

Sincerely,

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: 33 Letters Regarding Homeless Service Facilities
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 12:24:17 PM
Attachments: [33 Letters Regarding Homeless Service Facilities.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 33 letters regarding homeless service facilities in the Bayview District.

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: [Rolando Ajpop](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Friday, May 2, 2025 2:55:40 PM

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 **Rolando Ajpop**

Email rolajpop@gmail.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Barbara Gratta](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 11:17:45 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Barbara Gratta**

Email **grattawines@gmail.com**

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Jon Salabsab](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 11:53:34 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Jon Salabsab**
Email jon.salabsab@gmail.com

I live in District

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days.
Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or vehicularly housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH, DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.

Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Brian Lagerhausen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Brian Lagerhausen**

Email **blagerhausen@gmail.com**

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

No

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Mike Krasilnikoff](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 12:24:34 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 **Mike Krasilnikoff**

Email **mike.krasilnikoff@gmail.com**

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

No

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Jadine Trujillo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 12:26:27 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Jadine Trujillo**

Email **jadine_solis@hotmail.com**

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: Eleanor Harwood
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 12:26:36 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Eleanor Harwood

Email eleanor99harwood@gmail.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Tony Trujillo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 12:28:20 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Tony Trujillo**

Email tony.trujillosf@yahoo.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

No

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Ison Trujillo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 1:00:29 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Ison Trujillo**

Email **IceEBee@icloud.com**

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

No

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days.
Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Div Manickam](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 1:04:35 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Div Manickam**
Email nowhere.div@gmail.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the
city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities
currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925
Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City
is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at
2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and
20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from
our community the city now plans to alter the plan
which will create more congestion and bring more
people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we
strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully
request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days.
Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions
that provide dignified permanent housing and
support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Jenny Pritchett](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 1:09:33 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Jenny Pritchett**

Email **jennypritchett76@gmail.com**

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Allen Carpenter](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 1:16:31 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Allen Carpenter**

Email allendc1@gmail.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: Andrew Cantor
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 1:21:26 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 Andrew Cantor

Email cantor.legal@gmail.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: Jenifer Lake
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 2:03:25 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Jenifer Lake

Email bob.jen@mac.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Ed Stuever](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 2:28:35 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Ed Stuever**

Email estuever@hotmail.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days.
Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Chris Chung](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 4:33:20 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Chris Chung**

Email cristofe@gmail.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days.
Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Lynnet Spiegel](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 5:19:27 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Lynnet Spiegel**
Email lynnet@jeffreyspets.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

No

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days.
Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Cindy Changar](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 6:01:30 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Cindy Changar**

Email cchangar@rocketmail.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days.
Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Judah Dwyer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Saturday, May 3, 2025 6:32:32 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Judah Dwyer**

Email theafricanoutlet@gmail.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days.
Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: Matthew McAndrew
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Sunday, May 4, 2025 7:12:29 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Matthew McAndrew

Email matthewmcandrewmd@gmail.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

3) a clear vision from the Mayor about how he
intends to lift up the Bayview during his tenure.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Miz Le](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Sunday, May 4, 2025 10:46:27 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Miz Le**

Email sle05@gsm.uci.edu

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

No

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Trang Thien](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Sunday, May 4, 2025 10:54:23 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Trang Thien**

Email sle05@gsm.uci.edu

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

No

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days.
Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Patricia Mitchell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Sunday, May 4, 2025 12:54:24 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 and Mayor

From your constituent

Email pmitchell415@aol.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this Town Hall when scheduled? Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 “tiny cabins” and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

- 1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: Michelle Lewis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Sunday, May 4, 2025 5:08:33 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 and Mayor

From your constituent Michelle Lewis

Email mishelka@yahoo.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Christina Velasco](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Sunday, May 4, 2025 5:26:37 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Christina Velasco**

Email **christina.velasco@yahoo.com**

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days.
Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Marcus Harvey](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Sunday, May 4, 2025 5:48:30 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Marcus Harvey**
Email marcusharvey@me.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the
city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities
currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925
Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City
is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at
2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and
20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from
our community the city now plans to alter the plan
which will create more congestion and bring more
people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we
strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully
request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days.
Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions
that provide dignified permanent housing and
support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: shoshanah.dobry
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Sunday, May 4, 2025 7:20:37 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 and Mayor

From your constituent shoshanah.dobry

Email shoshod5623@gmail.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days.
Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

I would also appreciate it if this town hall could be
held at the SE Community Center so that the most
people in D10 will be able to attend in person, if they
would like to.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: Iris Bucchioni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:42:42 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Iris Bucchioni

Email irismvbucchioni@yahoo.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

No

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Holly Peterson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:57:41 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent **Holly Peterson**
Email holly.peterson@me.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: Jay Jankowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 10:46:35 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 and Mayor

From your constituent Jay Jankowski

Email jankowja@gmail.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Last can we spread shelters into affluent
neighborhoods like Noe Valley? Pacific Heights?
Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Ronald Mungai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 11:42:54 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Ronald Mungai**

Email **limo4usf@gmail.com**

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

No

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: [Daphne Blumenthal](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 3:50:30 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 and Mayor

From your constituent **Daphne Blumenthal**

Email **daphne@tierrait.com**

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

No

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

From: Judith Keenan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 4:56:38 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 and Mayor

From your constituent Judith Keenan

Email keenan.352016@gmail.com

I live in District

Would you like to join in this
Town Hall when scheduled?

Yes

Respect the Bayview: Request for Town Hall & Moratorium on Activity

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie,

District 10 hosts a disproportionate 17.6% of the city's homeless population.

In addition to the three homeless service facilities currently located and operating in the Bayview (1925 Evans, 500/598 25th Street, 125 Bayshore) the City is now opening a new facility, "Jerrold Commons", at 2177 Jerrold Avenue.

This site was originally slated for 60 "tiny cabins" and 20 RV parking spaces. Without notice or input from our community the city now plans to alter the plan which will create more congestion and bring more people to the facility.

As a residents in the Bayview community, we strenuously object to this expansion.

We the Bayview Residents, hereby respectfully request:

1) a Town Hall with the Mayor in the next 30 days. Agenda: to discuss long-term strategies for solutions that provide dignified permanent housing and support services for those currently unhoused or

vehicularily housed in the Bayview.
Participants: Mayor, Mayor's Office, HSH, DPH,
DAS, SFPD, and any other necessary City offices.
Please contact Claudia Anderson to schedule the
Town Hall.

2) a moratorium on the creation of any new, or the
expansion of existing shelters, triage centers, or
similar facilities until such time as a formal long-term
plan is established.

Thank you for your time and attention to this
important matter.

Sincerely,
Bayview Residents
cc: Board of Supervisors

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: 83 Letters Regarding Organization that Receive City Funds
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 12:25:48 PM
Attachments: [83 Letters Regarding Organizations that Receive City Funds.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 83 letters regarding organizations that receive city funds.

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: Griffin Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2025 10:25:30 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Griffin Lee

Email griffin.gregory.lee@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [William Hall](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:36:38 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 **William Hall**

Email **wiliamhall2020@icloud.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that lobbies SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA. Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working,

taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [nina geneson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:36:38 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 [nina geneson](#)
Email ninagotis@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that lobbies
SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such
organizations should be terminated effective
immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San
Francisco government. And both receive substantial
funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.
Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working,

taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Martin Horwitz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:36:41 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Martin Horwitz**
Email martin7ahorwitz@yahoo.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that lobbies
SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such
organizations should be terminated effective
immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San
Francisco government. And both receive substantial
funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.
Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working,

taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [John Goldberg](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:38:45 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 **John Goldberg**

Email **jrg2025@aol.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that lobbies SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA. Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working,

taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Ansel Wettersten](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 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 **Ansel Wettersten**

Email awawd@mac.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that lobbies
SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such
organizations should be terminated effective
immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San
Francisco government. And both receive substantial
funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.
Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working,

taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Hatun Noguera](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:43:37 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Hatun Noguera**

Email noguera@changes.world

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that lobbies
SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such
organizations should be terminated effective
immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San
Francisco government. And both receive substantial
funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.
Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working,

taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [John Robert Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:44:29 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent John Robert Smith
Email timepuzzle@earthlink.net

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that lobbies
SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such
organizations should be terminated effective
immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San
Francisco government. And both receive substantial
funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.
Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working,

taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [David Mace](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:49:23 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **David Mace**

Email **dmace7@gmail.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that lobbies SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA. Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working,

taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Andrew Gottlieb
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:51:42 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Andrew Gottlieb

Email agottlieb51@icloud.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that lobbies
SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such
organizations should be terminated effective
immediately. THIS IS LONG PAST DUE !

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San
Francisco government. And both receive substantial
funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.
Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working,

taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Tom Flint
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:53:38 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 Tom Flint

Email thomasflint1@yahoo.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that lobbies
SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such
organizations should be terminated effective
immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San
Francisco government. And both receive substantial
funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.
Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working,

taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Renee Lazear](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:00:38 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 **Renee Lazear**

Email redpl@aol.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that lobbies
SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such
organizations should be terminated effective
immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San
Francisco government. And both receive substantial
funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.
Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working,

taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Julia Fell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:02:41 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Julia Fell**

Email juwifell@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that lobbies
SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such
organizations should be terminated effective
immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San
Francisco government. And both receive substantial
funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.
Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working,

taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,
Julia Fell

From: [Mitchell Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:02:50 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Mitchell Smith
Email htimsm1@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that lobbies SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA. Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working,

taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Martha Ehmann Conte](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:05:54 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 **Martha Ehmann Conte**
Email martha@ehmannconte.com

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message:
Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that lobbies SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA. Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life for the majority of hard working,

taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Cornell Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:08:42 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Cornell Lee

Email corny1215@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San
Francisco government. And both receive substantial
funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.
Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Brad McMillan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:17:41 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Brad McMillan

Email mcmillan@viselect.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Libby Adler](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:26:41 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Libby Adler**

Email **libby.adler@gmail.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [richard brandi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:27:31 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 [richard brandi](#)
Email rbrandi@earthlink.net

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Brian Key](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:27:46 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 **Brian Key**

Email **Brian@BrianKey.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Frances Hochschild](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:38:42 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Frances Hochschild**
Email fhochschild@yahoo.com

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Usha and John Burns](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:38:48 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 **Usha and John Burns**
Email **Johnmburns48@yahoo.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Iris Bucchioni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:41:28 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Iris Bucchioni

Email irismvbucchioni@yahoo.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Tony Tantillo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:46:30 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Tony Tantillo**

Email ttantillo54@aol.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Denise Selleck](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:46:44 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 **Denise Selleck**

Email **deniselleck@sbcglobal.net**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Patrick Ryan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:47:45 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 **Patrick Ryan**

Email **pgryan209@yahoo.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Lorenzo DiCarlo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:50:35 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Lorenzo DiCarlo**

Email **ladicarlo@gmail.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Holly Peterson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:59:34 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Holly Peterson**
Email holly.peterson@me.com

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Esfir Shrabyer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 10:08:41 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent [Esfir Shrabyer](#)

Email to_fira@yahoo.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely, Esfir Shrayber

From: jason jungreis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 10:16:43 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 jason jungreis
Email jasonjungreis@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Robyn Lipsky](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 10:19:44 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 **Robyn Lipsky**
Email jasonrobyn@gmail.com

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

Robyn Lipsky

From: [Neville Morcom](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 10:21:37 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Neville Morcom**
Email nmorcom@comcast.net

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Glen Harvey](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 10:25:34 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Glen Harvey**

Email **gharveysf@gmail.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,**

I'm very angry about this issue and writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco

Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families. I'm done with the SFMTA being able to fund these special interest groups and then threaten Cable cars, crossing guards in schools, and curtail Muni service because of it's throwing money into making the majority of San Franciscans miserable. I won't vote for any proposition funding Muni or SFMTA until the SFMTA Board is reconstituted

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Larry Quantz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 10:28:42 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Larry Quantz**
Email jkj2000@yahoo.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

Larry Quantz

From: robert mayer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 10:38:45 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 robert mayer

Email robertmayersf@aol.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Pat Stanton](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 11:11:42 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Pat Stanton**

Email pstanton1224@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Sanjay Verma](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 11:31:26 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Sanjay Verma**

Email **sanjayverma44@gmail.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Ronald Mungai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 11:33:29 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Ronald Mungai**

Email **limo4usf@gmail.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Anastasia Fink](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 11:39:22 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 **Anastasia Fink**

Email **sfink1420@gmail.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Gretchen Koch](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 11:49:25 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Gretchen Koch**
Email gretchenee@gmail.com

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Kathleen Gee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 11:55:33 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Kathleen Gee**
Email **kathygee606@att.net**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

This is not impartial or right.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Irene Deutsch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 1:08:32 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 Irene Deutsch
Email ideut8@comcast.net

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Nancy Wolf](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 1:13:31 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 **Nancy Wolf**

Email n.wolf@mindspring.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Shirley Fogarino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 1:53:35 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Shirley Fogarino

Email scoopfoggy@prodigy.net

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

I've seen this so many times, especially with SFMTA
and its budget lines for the Bicycle Coalition, Walk
San Francisco and other organizations that it "funds".
They are then under obligations to attend meetings,
call in and testify in favor of often outrageous SFMTA
budget proposals! Time to halt this unethical and
ridiculous scam involving SFMTA and other city
agencies!

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my

interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Daphne Blumenthal](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 3:48:27 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 **Daphne Blumenthal**
Email daphne@tierrait.com

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**
Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Charles Farrugia](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 4:00:26 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Charles Farrugia**

Email ifitefire4u@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

Charles Farrugia

From: [Donna Turner](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 4:32:29 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Donna Turner**
Email ticklebug@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Brian Adler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 5:15:25 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Brian Adler

Email familyadler@hotmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF have
conspired against the majority of D1 and D4 citizens
with the complicity of SFMTA to implement their
"War on Automobiles" ideology with the closure of
the Great Highway to autos. This collusion is the
very definition of government corruption.

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials

and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

Brian A.

From: Lou Ann Bassan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 5:31:33 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 Lou Ann Bassan
Email louann.bassan@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,
Lou Ann Bassan

From: [Barbara Dwyer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 6:13:40 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Barbara Dwyer**
Email montereydivingwoman@gmail.com

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Jennifer Raub
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 6:16:38 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 Jennifer Raub

Email jenneraub@hotmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
This conflict of interest is unacceptable.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: ROBERT GEASE
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 7:08:35 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent ROBERT GEASE
Email robgease@yahoo.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Jeff Roberts](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 11:11:29 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Jeff Roberts**

Email je-al-ro@sbcglobal.net

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Gabrielle Lavelle](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 11:42:29 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Gabrielle Lavelle
Email gcatlavelle@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Doug McKirahan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 7:36:44 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 **Doug McKirahan**

Email **ratt57@pacbell.net**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Jasmine Madatian](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 7:37:29 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Jasmine Madatian**
Email madatian.j@gmail.com

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Griffin Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 9:41:45 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 Griffin Lee

Email griffin.gregory.lee@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that lobbies
SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such
organizations should be terminated effective
immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively lobby SFMTA and San
Francisco government. And both receive substantial
funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.

As a taxpayer I am appalled that I am funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.
Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working,

taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Johnson Eng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 10:29:52 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Johnson Eng**

Email **jeng55@gmail.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Tam Tam
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 11:03:41 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Tam Tam

Email tamsfo12@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good. They are political lobby
groups with self enriching agendas that do not reflect
the greater good for San Francisco or San
Franciscans.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received

\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately. Stop the overbuilding of unnecessary "infrastructure" Please!

Sincerely, Tam

From: [Lindsay Glaser](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 1:17:23 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 [Lindsay Glaser](#)

Email lglaser17@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Shelby Cowell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 1:19:29 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Shelby Cowell**

Email **shelbycowell@gmail.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Angela Lee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 1:21:34 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 **Angela Lee**

Email angiekye@hotmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,
Angela Lee

From: [Cryzta Sayle](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 1:22:44 PM

This message is 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 **Cryzta Sayle**

Email **csayle2010@gmail.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Daniel Coker](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 1:26:34 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 **Daniel Coker**
Email deardanielcoker@gmail.com

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Amy Carr](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 1:33:19 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent [Amy Carr](#)

Email amy.grossi.carr@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

Amy Carr

From: [Christina Gill](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 1:37:44 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Christina Gill**

Email cxmonga@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Norah Uyeda](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 5:05:37 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 **Norah Uyeda**
Email **Yuenuyeda@yahoo.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Suzan Yee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 5:35:38 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 **Suzan Yee**

Email **syee@tsaoyee.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Margaret Gabbert
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 7:37:25 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 Margaret Gabbert
Email mgadoy22@hotmail.com
Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [david O'Brien](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 7:11:37 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **david O'Brien**
Email **davidseano@yahoo.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Mary OConnell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 10:15:37 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Mary OConnell**

Email marymmoc@yahoo.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [mari eliza](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 2:07:54 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent [mari eliza](#)

Email zrants@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Transfer whatever funds you were directing to the non-profits to the SF teachers who are most qualified to teach safety protocols.

Sincerely,

Mari Eliza

From: [Karen Breslin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 3:04:33 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 **Karen Breslin**
Email kbsmail@sbcglobal.net

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Ruth Levy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 3:05:30 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 Ruth Levy

Email rjlevy50@yahoo.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Doug McKirahan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 3:15:27 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 **Doug McKirahan**

Email **ratt57@pacbell.net**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [kathryn gaehwiler](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 3:24:37 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 [kathryn gaehwiler](#)

Email kathryn135@yahoo.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Maura Lewis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 3:27:27 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 **Maura Lewis**

Email maura.a@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations
who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high;
there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous
mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Evelyn Graham
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 4:17:34 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 Evelyn Graham
Email evelynG@mail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Senta Tsantilis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 4:41:32 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Senta Tsantilis
Email sptsantilis@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any
San Francisco government funding to any
organization, non-profit or other entity that
coordinates with San Francisco government entities
and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall.
Any and all grants to such organizations should be
terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and
Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and
then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government
on behalf of those same projects. And both receive
substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers.
The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special
interest organizations that lobby against my
interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve
contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials
and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and
San Francisco Bike Coalition has received
\$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And
there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco
Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Christina Shih](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 5:04:28 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 **Christina Shih**
Email cyssf2003@yahoo.com

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Lobby SF Government/
SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and
Board of Supervisors,**

I am appending my own words to this email. I am disgusted at how so much effort and money is spent on a very small percentage of SF residents (bicyclists) the detriment of the vast majority (who use public transportation or personal vehicles). I follow the SFMTA publications very closely re issues like Vision Zero and the Modes of Transportation studies. For the latter, despite all the efforts to create biking infrastructure, bicycle use has not increased significantly. I read the Biking and Rolling proposal thinking as I read it more money down the drain to cater to the smallest segment of transport modes.

Time to re-set and start working on the greatest good for the greatest number of SF residents. Improve Muni (I will walk or take Muni or use my car but I am NOT going to ride a bicycle as a 75 yo woman). Particularly in the western part of SF we are a public transit desert and closing the Great Highway has harmed us immensely for what? Bicyclists to ride freely?

I'm writing to express my strenuous opposition to any San Francisco government funding to any organization, non-profit or other entity that

coordinates with San Francisco government entities and then lobbies those same entities/ SF City Hall. Any and all grants to such organizations should be terminated effective immediately.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from San Francisco's taxpayers. The optics aren't good.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Turn off the spigot.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to road closures, lane closures, removal of parking, increases in parking cost and safety concerns when riding the bus. Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's incredibly poor planning, lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility, as well as their funding of activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who lobby SFMTA and bully seniors, people with disabilities and many lower and middle class San Francisco families.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [K.Clements](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 8:54:37 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 **K Clements**

Email kateclemmac@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special organizations, PERIOD. It is unethical to approve these special interest contracts.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA. I walk a great deal in the city, but I am older, and on occasion must use my car.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior

leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS. We are already seeing traffic issues due to the closure of the Upper Great Highway.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately. One-sided research is an abomination.

Sincerely,
K Clements

From: [Don Emmons](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 9:11:26 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Don Emmons**

Email **emmo55@me.com**

Subject **No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA**

Message: **Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,**

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: [Roxanne Frye](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 9:37:33 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 [Roxanne Frye](#)

Email friedette@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received \$311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received \$2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is \$425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,
